

THE RAMBLER.

VOL. IV. *New Series.*

JANUARY 1861.

PART XI.

DÖLLINGER'S HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY.*

THERE is a witty saying of Jean Paul, suggested by the political and literary aspect of Europe at the beginning of this century, that the dominion over the earth belongs to the French, the sea to the English, and the air to the Germans. "Ideas," says the best historian of German poetry, "are our sword, and literature our field of battle." For ages past the Germans, who for a thousand years after the fall of Rome were the foremost power in the world, have been a people of thought more than action ; their influence has been intellectual rather than political, and their speculative activity has been sometimes a consolation and sometimes a source of public disasters and humiliation to the people. Those realms of thought in which they are most thoroughly at home have neither geographical boundaries nor national character, and that universality which is the special quality of their literature forms, in the absence of a jealous and exclusive patriotism, their chief political defect.

"What is it but a vain and curious skill
If sapient Germany must lie deprest
Beneath the brutal sword ? Her haughty schools
Shall blush ; and may not we with sorrow say,
A few strong instincts and a few plain rules,
Among the herdsmen of the Alps, have wrought
More for mankind at this unhappy day
Than all the pride of intellect and thought?"

The whole range of human knowledge is embraced in their studies ; every science is equally cultivated, and the his-

* *Christenthum und Kirche in der Zeit der Grundlegung* (Christianity and the Church in the Period of their Establishment). By J. J. Ig. Döllinger. Ratisbon, 1860.

tory of other countries and of other times is pursued almost as zealously as their own. Yet this very universality raises a barrier between them and other nations, and provokes that feeling of repulsion for the works of the Germans which is as common in England as in France and Italy. There is a want of human interest about the things they write; they do not seem to be actuated in literature by the same motives as ourselves, or to feel the same aspirations and passions, but live and write in a region we can hardly understand, and pursue objects for which we do not care. Their vast labours are carried on apparently without any definite purpose, without aiming at any particular result. With us Oriental learning is kept alive by our Eastern empire; ecclesiastical history is studied for the sake of controversy, English history for political reasons. If we had no Asiatic possessions, no political parties, and no religious sects, all these departments of literature would probably fall into comparative neglect. But in Germany external accidental considerations of this kind have very little weight. The increase of knowledge has been one of the necessities of the German mind since it was awakened by Lessing, and the practical applications, the moral or social consequences, however serious they may be, and however eagerly they may be discussed in popular regions, are not the primary motives of inquiry. For instance, the great critic who did most to establish the text of the *Iliad*, and that of the *Nibelungen Lied*, Lachmann, also published the best text of the New Testament which appeared before Tischendorf. The same critical skill and interest which he exhibited in examining the composition of the Greek and German epics also set him to work upon the Bible. Now this is widely remote from the practical spirit in which learning is pursued in this country. We have but little experience of that abstract love of knowledge for its own sake, of that self-denying and disinterested indifference to consequences, and of that faith in the consistency and harmony of all truths, which inspire the energy of the laborious German. We are always tempted when we meet with a new fact, and before we take the trouble to make a note of it, or to recognise its existence, to ask what it proves and where it will lead to, rather than to inquire how it is proved and what it is the result of; and we can hardly appreciate the pleasure with which men who have perfected to the utmost the instruments and the method of scientific research, employ their lives in applying them indefinitely to every conceivable object.

As a natural consequence, there are two principal objec-

tions which are generally made to the historical and theological books of the Germans,—that the former are defective in form and arrangement, and the latter incurably fanciful and unsound. As it is commonly understood, this implies much more than if it were said, what is notoriously true, that many famous scholars are bad writers, and that many of the German divines are rationalists, and much of their philosophy is pantheism. Nor is it enough to say in explanation of the first complaint, that the language, rich and pliable beyond most others, is less cultivated and refined than some. As a literary language, it has not existed in reality much more than a century. Leibniz was obliged to use French and Latin, and Frederick the Great could not write German correctly. Even now it is not an instrument which every educated man is competent to handle, or that can be managed without an effort; and many writers have neither time nor inclination to take the requisite trouble. But that the defect so far is in the men, not in the language, the works of Schiller are alone enough to prove.

The chief object of a scholar in writing a book lies in the new matter he can bring to light, in the novelty either of his facts or of his conclusions. But new discoveries cannot be dug up, and hewn, and polished into shape all at once. The new matter must pass often through many hands before its right place and proportion are assigned to it, and before it is permanently absorbed and admitted into the department to which it belongs. A writer who rests his aim and his fame in the advancement of learning may be satisfied with the performance of part of this labour. Other considerations make a book popular, but if it adds to the sphere of human knowledge and ideas, it is remembered for that alone. The progress of learning is so rapid that every book must soon become in some measure antiquated and superseded, and then the only merit that will be regarded is that of having contributed to the progress by which it has been left behind. This is the fruit of competition. Each writer knows that his book, in order to be read, must surpass those of his competitors in some substantial points, and that it must appear as soon as is consistent with excellence, otherwise the place it aimed at will be occupied, and the gap it was destined to fill will disappear. In order to obtain the success he seeks, eloquence is not required, and, besides, there is no time for it. In short, literature is so constituted in Germany, that an eminent author does not find it worth his while to write for those readers who are attracted by the beauties of style.

The charge of dullness is in reality nearly allied to the charge of a general obliquity of view, which is of more importance and of more general justice, but which is likewise founded on that method of scientific research which to the uninitiated is so distasteful and so strange. Our writers endeavour to please their readers by making their style as agreeable, or striking, or insinuating, as possible, and by presenting their ideas in the most acceptable light. Inasmuch as they aim at popularity, they are conscious that they are addressing an incompetent audience, that they will be read chiefly by persons who are not always prepared for the truth in its nakedness; and they therefore imitate Solon, and give, not the best they have, but the best that will go down. They think more of the ignorant who are to be persuaded, than of the wise who are to be convinced; and more of the public that requires to be taught, than of the truth which requires to be proclaimed. There is a sort of bargain between the author and his readers, in which some concessions must be made to their ignorance, their weakness, or their prejudices. A national, political, or sectarian partiality taints almost the whole of our literature; that is, an author considers not only what he believes to be true, but what the party he addresses will be disposed to believe; and the first test that will be applied to his book will be, to inquire whether it says what has been said before, whether it is within the range of ideas and of knowledge of the persons who judge it. Now a book that extends knowledge, a book of original thought and original research, has the very opposite character. Its effect will be to dissatisfy partisans, and to break down the exclusiveness of parties; to compel men to make room for the new facts, and to revise their opinions in conformity with them. Nowhere, except in Germany, are the dignity, the freedom, and the authority of learning acknowledged in this manner; and it is this which alienates us from their writings far more than the impieties of Feuerbach or Strauss. It is not so much the offensiveness of particular conclusions that repels us as the spirit in which all their inquiries are conducted. In this respect the Catholic and the Protestant literature of Germany are alike, and their effect upon Catholics and Protestants in other countries is the same; for, although the action of science has been more conspicuous in Protestant Germany, where the best and soundest of their divines and historians, who went out to curse the Church of God, have been compelled, in defiance of the traditions and even of the principles of their party, to utter blessings, and to bear an unwilling

testimony to her, yet the same principle of conscientious inquiry, the same reverence for the authority of science, has established itself during the last thirty years among the Catholics as well. They have abandoned the tone and the character of advocates, and have ceased to treat Catholicism as a party question, in which the object is to put forward the best side of things, to deny or to conceal by the artifices of rhetoric whatever may be less to the advantage of their cause, and to make the best use of the *argumentum ad hominem*.

They have regarded the ends of controversy as in no way distinct from the ends of learning, and have deemed the advancement of the one equivalent to the advancement of the other. For that which was said of the Popes by De Maistre is true, in a higher sense, of the Church—that she has need of truth, and of nothing else. For to her, who is the depositary and the protector of truth, truth alone is natural and congenial; and inasmuch as ignorance and error cannot permanently be kept asunder, inasmuch as truth belongs to the nature of God, and religion is allied with all truths and contradicted by all errors, the Church is not only the enemy of all falsehood, but indirectly, though necessarily, the promoter of all knowledge. She not only does not fear its increase, but requires it. Every other religion not only fears truth, but requires that it should be concealed or disguised. That which upholds the one destroys the other; consequently the adoption of the same principle of scientific inquiry by the writers of both parties has done as much for the disorganisation of Protestantism as for the support and corroboration of Catholicism; but on either side it has effected a great internal revolution. For whilst the old traditions and opinions which were the foundation and the pillar of Protestantism have been shaken in the eyes of the Protestants themselves, many traditions and habits which were the bane and the weakness of Catholic controversialists were struck by the same blow. In adopting the new mode and instruments of warfare, Catholic writers have necessarily taken up a position very remote from those extremes, and from those resources of argument, to which, in the conflict with Protestants, Jansenists, Gallicans, with the scoffers of the eighteenth century, and the scientific incredulity of the nineteenth, their predecessors have so often had recourse. For it is not too much to say—and we cannot say it without shame for ourselves and grief for thousands of souls that have suffered by it—that calumny has been hardly a more popular weapon among our adver-

saries than mendacity with ourselves ; and this has been, not the error of blindness or of ignorance, but in many cases the result of a consistent and elaborate design. Whilst the doctrines of the Reformation have been maintained by means of conventional fictions, which no believing Protestant ventures to assail, men have been found amongst us also whose faith was equally weak, and whose conscience at least equally elastic. It has therefore been seen, at every great stride made by profane or ecclesiastical learning, that its progress was resisted on grounds of religion even by Catholics themselves. It was so with the study of nature in the time of Galileo, and it was so likewise when the critical study of history was created by Tillemont and Mabillon, Papebroch and Noris.* And in our own time, if there is not the same resistance and the same antagonism, yet the chasm which separates the leaders of the new school of learning from the followers of the old is scarcely less extensive or less deplorable.

In one respect we English Catholics are at a great disadvantage. One of the chief means by which the spirit of learning has been developed in the Church in Germany is here totally wanting. Not that we are destitute of the example and guidance of writers of the first order, but that they are destitute of opponents who are worthy of them. It is in the nature of things that a man should be influenced almost as much by the character of the adversary with whom he carries on a prolonged contest, as by that of the friend with whom he lives. For he is compelled to adapt himself in some degree to the sort of hostility he encounters ; he imitates the arts of his adversary, sometimes his artifices, often his faults. Where this cannot be, the fighting is all on one side ; and thus Voltaire had it all his own way. He could not drag his adversaries down to his own level. Ferocity, marauding, negligence, are things learnt in war from an enemy, as well as discipline and vigilance. Now English Protestantism stands much higher morally than the Protestantism of Germany, but much lower intellectually. It is a much more conservative system,

* Attempts were made to obtain the prohibition or censure of the works of each of these eminent men, because, said one of their most learned contemporaries, they were in contradiction with certain opinions on matters not of faith but of fact : "Non con altro motivo che di essere opposti in cose disputabili e controverse alle particolari opinioni di chi vorrebbe che il proprio sentimento fosse regola a tutti, non tanto in cose filosofiche, e che nulla importano alla religione, quanto in verità storiche e di fatto." See Fontanini's memorial to Clement XI. in defence of the annals of Tillemont. CC. Venetorum ad Magliabechium, epistolæ i. 267.

but it is much less addicted to, and less dependent upon, science and learning. The qualities in which it shines the Catholics possess, for the most part, in a still higher degree. In those things in which we most require instruction, it has little that will avail us. Precisely because Protestantism is more respectable here than abroad, it is more unprofitable to contend with it. In England a man shrinks from pursuing his opinions to their logical consequences, or from uttering them if they lead to consequences he is afraid of. Mr. Mill, Mr. Grote, and Mr. Buckle are as far removed from every positive form of Protestantism as Proudhon from every form of Christianity, but their tone is generally decorous. Mr. Darwin refrains from publishing the opinion which it is not denied that he holds, that men grew out of apes; and in the debate on the Census in the House of Commons, it was urged that it would be a great hardship and injustice to compel freethinkers to declare that they believed in no God. We may applaud this reserve; yet it signifies that the English people, who tolerate every opinion, are not ripe for the recognition of that principle of free inquiry which, while it leads Protestants to unbelief on the one hand, carries them also to the Catholic Church. That is another reason why it cannot make its way. Dislike of Popery is as strong an element in Anglican theology as dislike of unbelief. A moderate amount of sincere investigation would scatter to the winds most of the stories on which that part of the popular belief is founded; consequently a species of artificial terrorism keeps down a movement which would certainly be fatal to Protestantism, and as certainly would be favourable to Catholicism. Speaking of his own country, Möhler says (*Gesammelte Schriften*, p. 261):

“As long as the doctrines of Luther and Calvin were really believed, the Protestant Church possessed no poetry, no history, no philosophy. It is certain that whilst the Protestant community was Lutheran it had no philosophy, and when it obtained a philosophy it was no longer Lutheran. Thus their faith repels philosophy, and their philosophy repels faith. When their common faith was set aside, and there was no longer a link connecting them with each other, then came the meridian of their literature. And it was needful that it should attain that high perfection, that the nature of Protestantism might be brought to light. That nature is now in all respects abundantly ascertained, and can be concealed from nobody. The literature of Protestantism is a great fact in the history of mankind, but a dark spot in the history of Christianity. In the Catholic Church art and learning were always

Christian ; and when they could not exhibit that character, preferred to be silent altogether. Nothing is more certain than that the more the principle of individualism is carried out in Protestantism, the more brilliant its products will be ; and, on the contrary, the more perfect the unity of the Catholic community, the more arts and sciences flourish within it."

And it must be remembered that, whatever the immediate result, whether the new road is followed to the right or to the left, in either case it serves the cause of truth. Either it dissipates error, or it pushes error to its extreme, and cures in one case homœopathically, in the other allopathically. It is in the nature of each science that history should do service in the first more direct mode, philosophy in the other. In Germany this has been conspicuously true. It was more easy to show the falsehood of the historical premises of Protestantism than to prove speculatively the truth of revelation. But even in metaphysics, after the followers of Hegel had passed from pantheism to atheism, a reaction commenced, of which we have seen only the beginning. No system that breaks with Christianity is now able to maintain itself, and all the more eminent philosophers speak, if not like Protestants, at least like Christians.

In this country, so long as that Protestant tradition, which is so well described in the *Anglican Difficulties*, retains its authority over learned men, we must continue to be deprived of the greatest incentive to intellectual exertion and to scientific study, and can have very little sympathy or understanding for a literature developed under influences so different from those by which we are surrounded. Only by passing more or less through the same process, acquiring the same experience, encountering the same description of opponents, shall we be enabled to adopt the spirit and the results of German scholarship.* And the time when this must come

* In a note to the sermon on the Theory of Developments in religious doctrine (*Sermons on the Theory of Religious Belief*, 1843, p. 343), Dr. Newman says, "It is not more than an hyperbole to say, that in certain cases a lie is the nearest approach to truth." Perhaps we may apply this paradox to the instance of the results of German learning, as presented to English readers. A mere result, a disconnected fact, taken by itself, may appear as startling as the saying we have just quoted, if the process by which it is reached is kept out of sight, and this process must remain a mystery until we familiarise ourselves with the methods of inquiry ; and this, again, cannot be without a revolution in our habits of thought. If we substitute for the notion of *inferiority*, which Dr. Newman is using here for his illustration, the notion of simple *difference*, we may throw some light on our meaning by quoting the text to which the note refers. "We are obliged to receive information needful to us, through the medium of our existing ideas, and consequently with but a vague apprehension of its subject-matter. Children, who are made our patterns in Scripture, are taught by an accommodation,

to pass is visibly approaching. In the extreme of the Broad-Church party, and in the extreme of the High-Church party, in the school of Dr. Arnold and in the school of the *Union*, Anglicanism exhibits the signs of that movement which in Protestant Germany has redounded so wonderfully to the advantage of religion. From each of these we may learn something. One should compel us to consider what is the real objective teaching of the Church, and what are the conventional accessories and the results of private authority, in order that we may not oppose them with phantoms, and repel those who are seeking the Church by putting forward in her place the opinions of parties. On the other hand, those who are dragging Protestantism to its dissolution may do us the same service which their masters in Germany have done before them, if we prepare ourselves to accept their challenge, and to embark in a course which it would be fatal to refuse, but which is full of peril if it is not pursued with consistency, conscientiousness, and vigour. The example of Catholic Germany is full of encouragement. For the influence by which the great revival of religion has been accomplished went forth from the lecture-rooms of the Universities; and it was wrought by those who had the command of the press and of the education of the clergy. Long after the restoration of religion in France, in Germany it continued at the lowest ebb. The religious orders were abolished, the property of the Church was confiscated, three-fourths of the episcopal sees were vacant, the administration of ecclesiastical affairs was entirely in the hands of the secular power, and the priests were formed and instructed by Febronian, Josephine, or infidel professors. Excepting the venerable Bishop Sailer of Ratisbon, there was hardly one orthodox writer of any note amongst the Catholic clergy. A generation has scarcely passed away, and the Catholics of Germany have acquired in zeal and fidelity nearly the same distinction as in letters. In Prussia and in Baden, two great conflicts with the State and with popular opinion have been successfully maintained; ecclesiastical liberty has been conquered in Austria and in Wirtemberg; and every where the aspect of religion has been greatly changed.

An example of the almost universal decline of faith during

on the part of their teachers, to their immature faculties and their scanty vocabulary. To answer their questions in the language which we should use towards grown men would be simply to mislead them, if they could construe it at all. We must dispense and 'divide' the word of truth, if we would not have it changed, as far as they are concerned, into a word of falsehood; for what is short of truth in the letter may be to them the most perfect truth, that is, the nearest approach to truth compatible with their condition."

the period which followed the French war, and of the prevalence of vague and dangerous tendencies, which there was no influence of authority or of opinion in Germany to restrain, is to be found in the short but brilliant career of the man who was the first to take a higher tone, and who put down the lax Catholicism of the day, after having overcome its action on himself. The earliest writings of Möhler bore abundant traces of the spirit of the age when they were written. In the preface to his minor works, Döllinger speaks of some essays which he has omitted, "because they belong to an early immature phase of his opinions, which his extensive study of Christian antiquity, and his profound feeling of religion, soon led him to abandon for ever." As early as 1820, when Möhler was only twenty-five, he startled old divines both by the extent of his knowledge, and by the originality and temerity of his views. "He devoted himself," says one of his early friends, "to a resolute and scientific pursuit of learning, with an enthusiasm for the freedom of inquiry; and his sentiments were not always in harmony either with the doctrines of religion or with the institutions of the Church." Thus, in 1824, we find him advocating—in a very different tone from that in which the *Symbolik* discusses the question—the universal concession of the chalice to the laity, and defending, in the following year, the use of the vernacular in the liturgy. "He could not conceive," he said, "why it was deemed better to run the risk of schism than to yield to so just a demand." These articles appeared anonymously in the first theological journal of the time, and the responsibility for their appearance is borne by the whole Catholic Faculty of Divinity at Tübingen, at that time, and perhaps still, the first in Germany. In the same year appeared his book on the unity of the Church, in which there is so much that is excellent, that it is often put with great benefit into the hands of Protestants in England, but in which the institution of the Episcopate and the Catholic Hierarchy are seriously misrepresented. Yet this was so little considered, that he immediately received an offer of a professorship of theology at Tübingen, and of another at Freiburg, and would, but for the resistance of Hermes, have had the choice of a third at Bonn.

When his *Athanasius* and his *Symbolik* had raised him to the first rank of Catholic divines, Möhler defined, in the following terms, that which is the common foundation of theology in Germany at the present day. "The explanations which, at different times, the Church has given of the primitive faith were mostly called forth by heretical parties, after a contest more or less prolonged. At all times, therefore,

and every where, when the ecclesiastical dogma, the expression which the Church has given, is to be fully explained and interpreted, it is necessary to have recourse to history. At the same time, the proofs of the dogma are principally traditional, that is to say, historical. It is therefore evident that, without a profound study of ecclesiastical history, the science which we understand by dogmatic theology cannot subsist.* In obedience to this principle, the most remarkable dogmatic work that has appeared in Germany since Möhler's Symbolism, the *Dogmatik* of Kulm, is constructed on what may be called the historical method. "The only sure way," says Kulm, "to find out the definite idea of a dogma, and the only way really consistent with the principles of the Church, consists in pursuing its objective development in the Church from the beginning. This is the business of the traditional proof, which thus prepares the way for the speculative part of theology by fulfilling the conditions on which its performance depends."† The second volume contains the treatise on the Trinity. In the first part (pp. 1 to 90), the scriptural teaching on the subject is explained; then comes (90 to 494) the discussion and successive definition by the Church; and finally (494 to 653), the speculative examination of the doctrine. So that the thing which the mediæval and great part of the modern divines took for granted and did not discuss at all,—the external truth of the doctrine, and its agreement with the belief of the Church in all ages,—here occupies three times as much space as that which was formerly considered the whole duty of the divine. That portion of the argument which now receives so much attention was formerly deemed to be supplied by the sentences of Peter the Lombard, which continued to be the text-book of commentators till the end of the sixteenth century. Even Petavius collected the authorities from the Fathers merely, as he says, to prove that matters of faith and of doctrine, as they are now held, are not modern inventions—*ut non pro inventis humanæ calliditatis habeatur, ac morosis et delicatis ludibrium debeat*. In like manner, most of the modern writers content themselves with asserting that such a doctrine was so taught and believed by the Fathers, and then refer to a number of passages as a proof. In this way even the continuity and consistency of the dogma is not established; for only that can be considered as proved to be the common belief of a particular age in which the most eminent authorities in the different countries are

* Historisch-politische Blätter, iv. 137.

† Dogmatik, 1208.

without exception agreed.* The real opinion of an author is not understood by simply quoting a passage here and there from his writings. The whole of his teaching upon each point must be brought to light, and that not with one writer preferred on account of his eminence, but with all the monuments of tradition. But what is now demanded is more even than the proof of continuity, not only to show that the original belief has been preserved, but to show how it has been developed. It is treated, not merely as a question of tradition, but as a question of development. It is not merely the history of essential conservation, but the history of consistent and continuous progress. An attempt is made, not simply to compare the doctrine in its present definite form with its original expression, but to trace its growth from the primitive age of the Church to the present. According to this theory, the fulness of the knowledge of her doctrine given to the Church is neither contained in Scripture nor fixed at any period in the acts of councils or in the writings of divines.

What has been written at any time is but a memorial of the faith and knowledge of the time in which it was written,—one link in the chain of tradition, one step in the process of development. Each age has therefore its part in the work, and every heresy fulfils a providential mission. The business of the divine is, therefore, to consult the stream of doctrine from the source to the latest period of its progress, giving to each portion its just and necessary importance, but deeming his knowledge fragmentary and imperfect if it does not embrace the whole, otherwise he will inevitably substitute the authority of individuals for the authority of the Church; he will be a follower of Paul, or of Apollos, or of Cephas, not of Christ. This is in direct contradiction, therefore, with those who seek the whole teaching of Christ in the Bible, with those who raise up a single great teacher *præter omnes*, or *instar omnium*,—as the Greeks revered St. Cyril, the Jansenists St. Augustine, or in a less degree the Dominicans St. Thomas,—and with those who imagine that the growth of doctrine is concluded, and the Church fixed in her forms and her substance. In this way the future advancement of religious knowledge is founded on the whole past history of the Church, not on the opinions of any particular school. It is in this sense that Dr. Kulm,

* “Tunc unanimis consensus patrum cumulate probatus æstimari debet, cum singularum nationum eminentissimi in alicujus rei adsertione consentiant, ita ut inter illos nemo, qui semper orthodoxus semper orthodoxis adhesit, dissentiat.” This is the rule laid down by Duperron, and approved by Benedict XIV.

for instance, understands an historical theology as distinguished from the theology of the schools. The doctrine is not merely in the form in which it is to be communicated, but in the form in which it may be increased.

We shall not attempt to determine how far this is the common practice and method of divines, or how far it is a further element of singularity or of novelty on the part of the German writers. It is said that, at the promulgation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, an objection was raised to a document which contained or implied a recognition of the theory of developments in doctrine, on the ground that it was not the generally-received opinion. We all remember the opposition that was raised to the theory of Dr. Newman. At any rate, the method of which we have taken the work of Kulm as our example, is as perfectly distinct from the manner in which the divines of the seventeenth century wrote on theology, as the method of Petavius from that of the scholastics; and it has nowhere been applied with greater consistency, or with more surprising results, than in the work just published by one of whom Kulm has said that he is not only the greatest divine of our age, but among the greatest of any age. It is time that we should turn our attention to it.

In the introduction to the *History of Christianity* which appeared some years ago, Dr. Döllinger drew a picture of the world, and of the doctrines which the Church was to overcome. This volume describes the supernatural foundation of the Church in the age of Christ and the Apostles, but stops before the beginning of the great conflict between the two cities. We have seen that the divines who follow the historical method deal with theology as a science requiring historic exposition more than dialectical discussion; it follows, therefore, that their treatment of history is essentially theological. If it is the business of dogmatic theology to show how each doctrine preserved its original substance in growing into its present form, it is the business of the historian to trace from the beginning the internal as well as the outward progress of the Church, to follow the growth of her ideas in the conflict with error, of her customs in the conflict with sin, and of her institutions through all the various influences of history. The work is divided into three books. The first contains the history of Christ, and of the four Apostles whose lives are fully known; the second expounds the teaching of the Apostles, the germs of Catholic theology; and the third describes the constitution and the religious life and practices of the early Church.

The plan and spirit of the book may be understood from the following extracts :

“The naturalist who opens and dissects a grain of seed is unable, even with the utmost care and attention, to determine what particular forms of vegetable existence are potentially contained in it, or to describe the shape into which it will grow. . . . In like manner, not only the heathens, but the early Christians themselves, were far from perceiving the constructive energy and the range of the moral and spiritual forces which were deposited in their community and intrusted to their ministry. But we have nearly two thousand years of the history of Christianity spread out before our eyes, and are able to comprehend and to measure that constant advance and growth, that process of development accomplished by internal necessity and consistency, which, though never overstepping the limits of the original principle of religious life, has gone far beyond the simple outlines and the primitive forms and manifestations of the apostolic age. In the light of this long experience, in which every successive period serves as the commentary to illustrate that which went before, we find the instrument for penetrating more deeply into the spirit of the Church of the Apostles, and for exhibiting her nature more fully than former generations could do it. . . . In these beginnings lie the forces and the germs of a civilisation which, after the lapse of eighteen centuries, is still growing, still advancing in fulfilment of its mission to all mankind, and a wealth of plastic ideas, an abundance of new creations in State, in Church, in art, in science, and in society, which are still far from being exhausted, and which in ages to come will yet bring forth political and scientific systems such as we yet can barely conceive.

Among the *charismata* enumerated by St. Paul, there is that of prophecy, but no special gift of authorship. Several of the Apostles have left no written works. After the death of Christ, a quarter of a century elapsed before a beginning was made, and then all who wrote were induced to do so by particular motives, and not by the intention of leaving behind them religious documents, or complete confessions of belief, like the books of Moses and the Prophets, or like the holy books of other religions, which professed to be the divinely-revealed codes of law and doctrine. No Apostle thought it necessary, none of them undertook to put down compendiously, in one or more works, the sum of all that he taught by word of mouth; and it could still less be intended that the writings of the several Apostles, separately incomplete but collectively complete, should exhibit the whole of the Christian dogma. That this could not be their aim is evident, because the Apostles did not write after a previous understanding and arrangement with each other. . . . St. Paul laid more stress on what he wrought by word of mouth, on sight and speech, than on writing. Whilst he wrote to the Christians at Rome the longest and most instructive of his epistles, he nevertheless yearned to see them, in order to confirm their faith out of the

riches of his mind. . . . In all the apostolic epistles the knowledge of the substance of belief is assumed. . . . They are very far from constituting, either separately or collectively, a system of doctrine or an epitome of faith. The very first fundamental dogma of Christianity, the dogma of the Trinity, which was so strange and repugnant to the Jews of that day, and unknown to the heathens, the doctrine which the Church was to be engaged for centuries in fixing and elucidating, is nowhere expressly discussed; it is always understood, and is only just touched incidentally. And yet without this doctrine, on which the whole fabric rested, Christianity could not be understood. . . . There is no trace of a collection of the Apostolic writings, or the establishment of a canon of the New Testament having been any where attempted during the Apostolic age by St. John or any eminent Christian. Nor have we all that the Apostles wrote. Two epistles of St. Paul are lost, and were not known to the ancient Church. And we hear nothing of steps taken by the Apostles or their immediate successors to supply all the churches with correct copies of their writings. . . . Nowhere in these earliest works, which do not bear testimony to each other, is it affirmed or supposed that only the writings of the Apostles or their disciples are to be taken as the rule of faith and Christian life; that in them alone, and nowhere else, instruction in the revelations of God is to be sought. Nowhere is it stated or implied that the Apostles have written all that it is essential for the faithful to know, or all that they had orally taught. At the close of his earthly career, St. Paul referred his disciple Timothy, not to his epistles, or to the writings of other Apostles, but to what he had heard from his lips; that teaching he was to commit to trusty men, that they might faithfully preserve it, and hand it on. Oral tradition, therefore, was the means which appeared to the Apostle most suited to hand down the Christian doctrines pure and genuine to those who were to follow, after the departure of the first generation of disciples; even where he referred the faithful to a former writing addressed to them, by which they were to hold, he was careful to give precedence to what they had heard, as the richer spring from which they were to draw.

The dogmatic tradition of the Jews was necessarily transferred to the Christian Church. . . . From that tradition came all that was taught concerning the Resurrection, Judgment, Paradise, Hell, without any definite testimony from the Hebrew canonical books. Much that regards the angels and the fallen spirits in the New Testament is derived, not from Scripture, but from tradition. . . . When a Jewish or heathen proselyte asked what he was to believe and to observe, he was not referred to the collection of the Apostolic writings, for the simple but all-sufficient reason that no fixed complete collection existed until a much later period, and at that time each church possessed only a few pieces. The catechumen was therefore directed to the doctrine handed down by oral tradition. This, he was told, is what the Apostles were taught by Christ, and what we have received from them and their disciples. . . .

The faith of each individual rested, therefore, on the twofold testimony of the Church,—that human and Divine testimony which in each community the younger generation received from the older, and that other parallel testimony which each church received from the others, and thereby from the whole. . . . Instructed, therefore, confirmed, and strengthened by this testimony, and already filled with a definite religious view, those whose zeal impelled them to it, read all the gospels and Apostolic epistles they could procure, and found in them the confirmation of what they had been already taught. They read these writings as belonging to the collective tradition of the Church, and forming the first written part of it. And as here the oral tradition, committed to the Church and continued in her, was first incorporated in written monuments, so it happened likewise in the next and in subsequent ages. At all periods the Church produced a literature consisting of monuments of contemporary tradition ; and thus a part of that which lived in the consciousness of the faithful was constantly fixed in writing, though naturally the whole of the belief present and living in the Christian community was never fully expressed in its literary productions and ecclesiastical documents. For it is not possible to write down the whole system of the life, the thought, and the feeling of a great society like the Church. The faith of each period was fed by these memorials of previous ages, above all, by those of the Apostles. Thus in each portion of ecclesiastical history the whole of the earlier times of the Church continued to work by means of the living organism which united the Church of the present with its past, through the unfailing power of the Divine word, "I am with you to the end of time," through practices and institutions which had been inherited, through the teachers who, though dead, still lived and spoke in their writings.

What the Apostles transmitted to the Church in speaking and writing was not a set of ready finished articles, a number of dogmas complete in matter and form, to preserve which carefully in her memory and in authentic copies, and to watch the heirloom of doctrine as a possession finished once for all, would be the only office of the Church. The first deposit of doctrine was a thing full of life, destined to have an organic growth ; and in obedience to a necessary interior impulse, and in harmony with the spiritual requirements of the faithful in different ages, to develop itself from its root, and to fashion for itself the most suitable expression. It consisted rather of facts, principles, dogmatic seeds and hints, which bore in themselves the tendency and the capacity of successive development and doctrinal evolution, and in which an abundance of dogmatic matter lay potentially included. Therefore, according to the historical character of the Christian religion, it was necessary that the doctrine should be successively developed, without alteration of its substance, in an order corresponding to the whole life of the Church, and in reciprocal communication with it. This was the work of the united intellectual efforts of the most enlightened Chris-

tians, continued for centuries, always building on the foundation of those who had preceded them, and ever penetrating deeper and deeper into the meaning of the Holy Writings, so as by degrees to lay open all the hints and germs of truth which they contain. This was promoted partly by the very nature of a Divine communication. Its design being to penetrate and to master, not only the sphere of morals, but the whole spiritual life of man, it must include an inexhaustible abundance of consequences, ever developing through the inevitable craving of the human mind, striving to open its way farther and farther into the doctrines it had received, to give them shape in a harmonious system, or to realise them in all their ramifications in a manner satisfying the demands of the understanding. Again, the heretical attempts successively made to corrupt or to dissolve all Christian doctrines, obliged Christians to fortify the points of attack, and to surround them as it were with a bulwark of more advanced and more profound definitions ; to protect the dogma intrusted to the keeping of the Church from all the dangers of partial or vicious interpretation, or of a false development ; to examine all its parts, to establish their full signification, and to secure them by ecclesiastical decrees. In such cases the tradition of the Church made itself heard through many voices, as the common conscience of the faithful, which felt itself threatened and outraged, and therefore pressed for positive decisions. Thus through the whole history of the Church the process continues by which doctrine is formed, and which the human intellect must undertake to pursue, not independently or influenced solely by natural impulses, but guided by the Paraclete, who is the Teacher of the Church. And thus the development and definition of doctrine was in reality the work of the same Spirit from whom the dogmatic contents of the New Testament originated ; and whatever admixture of narrowness, of error, or of passion there might be in the individuals who were the organs of this process, was made harmless by the action of the Divine Spirit that ruled the Church, and was consumed by the fires of spiritual purification.

The Christian system, from its intellectual and moral elevation, its mysteries incomprehensible to vulgar reason, and the inexorable earnestness of its moral precepts, is naturally exposed more than any other religion to the assaults and the disturbing and corrupting influences of human inclinations, selfish desires, and mental incapacity, and therefore to the danger of being misrepresented and degraded in the service of egotism and shortsighted passion. The Church escaped this peril which menaced her chief treasure, the principle of her existence, by the possession and the use of the apostolic writings and of the other ancient and subsequent documents of her faith, by the stability of that constitution which was her necessary organ for the preservation of tradition, and for the vigorous rejection of impure and pernicious elements, and by the protecting guidance and perpetual illumination of the Spirit of God. In every age the doctrine and tradition prevailing in the

Church was a product, at once human and divine, of the combined action of divine forces with human faith, the result of the life and the belief of all former generations. Her inner growth, the gradual evolving of the dogmatic principles to their consequences, the successive appearance of the articulate members which were included in the doctrinal germs, the multiplication and the extension of dogmatic decisions and formulas,—all this was accomplished by the union of three forces and modes of ecclesiastical action: the dialectical; the learned research directed to the memorials of early tradition, to the Bible and the early ecclesiastical literature; and the devotional contemplation of Scripture and of the mysteries. In a similar way, the religious knowledge of mankind before Christ had required more than a thousand years to proceed from the simple facts and articles of faith which constituted the religion of the Patriarchs, to the highly-developed system of belief which was professed by the Jewish contemporaries of our Lord,—for instance, by Pharisees like Gamaliel or Saul; and this was the development attained by the combination of progressive revelation and human intellect in a single nation; whilst in the great work of the development of Christian doctrine the most richly-endowed nations of three continents have employed themselves during eighteen hundred years. . . . Every man, whether cleric or layman, could take his share in the inquiry according to the measure of his gifts, and contribute his part to the great process of the formation and elucidation of Christian doctrine and opinion; he could do it with the greater confidence that he felt himself supported and preserved by the body to which he belonged, by the Church, whose virtual or actual approbation or rejection decided, sooner or later, upon the truth or error, the value or worthlessness, of his views,—provided only that he and the followers he might obtain possessed a faith strong enough and humble enough not to set themselves above the spirit of the Church" (Pref. pp. iv. iii., pp. 142, 145, 154, 156, 159, 161-165).

An attentive reader of these passages will easily understand the spirit in which this work is written, and the part that it assigns to history in the study of religious truth; but we have failed to give any idea of the singular dignity and terseness, and yet gracefulness, of the author's style. There is no part of the volume which is not intelligible even to persons unused to the language of theology. Whilst the extent and accuracy of research give a great value to the narrative in the first book, and to the description of early Christian life and institutions in the third, the clearness and simplicity with which questions of doctrine are explained, a merit more rare in Germany than with us, bestows on the second book an importance of a peculiar kind. For the points here described are in some sense the text upon which the history of Christianity is an incessant commen-

tary, and the true or false interpretation of which has been the source, on the one hand, of all Catholic theology, on the other of all controversies and of all heresies. If this work should be continued to modern times, treating in the same luminous manner the religious knowledge and discussions of each successive age, its importance, in a controversial point of view, can hardly be over-estimated. In this volume it requires an experienced eye to discern the controverted points which are implicitly treated, for the tone is never either polemical or apologetic. Perhaps we may say that there is much which would have a more specific interest for a Protestant than for a Catholic, to whom it may never have cost much thought or study. But these are matters which may be passed by in the pages of a Review devoted, not to questions of faith and theology,—which are discussed in Protestant controversy, but on which all Catholics are necessarily agreed,—but rather to those subjects which are not landmarks between two religions, not articles with which a faith must stand or fall, but on which Catholics may differ without prejudice to their orthodoxy, though not always without danger to their cause.

Dogmatically the chapters on the doctrine of justification are the most interesting and the most copious; for, of all questions of doctrine, it is that which has least participated in the process of development, and which must most of all be treated as a question of Scriptural interpretation. In the other places, consistently with the author's method, and with the theory we have endeavoured to explain in his own words, he does not so much seek to assimilate the primitive teaching and practices with their subsequent forms, or to prove the resemblance between the early and the later Church, but rather to bring a light in the less conspicuous facts of ecclesiastical antiquity, and in the latent significance of the apostolic writings, the obscure and almost invisible germs of doctrines and institutions which were destined to assume through the conflicts of many after ages proportions and an importance which originally could not be divined. The prophecies in particular receive great attention, and Dr. Döllinger has cast upon them all the light which the history of the Church has supplied. An appendix of thirty pages, on the history of the interpretation of the passage on the Man of Sin, gives an idea of the amount of labour bestowed on the difficult portions of the New Testament. In the text of the work all the scaffolding is removed, the quotations are almost exclusively from the original authorities, and the opinions of the modern writers are

seldom referred to, and hardly ever discussed, even in the notes.

Our readers will hardly expect us to give an account in detail of the contents of a book devoted to a subject of all others the most familiar to Christians. We have tried to explain its character in so far as it widely differs from other works on the same period; and it would be fruitless to indicate severally the peculiar conclusions of the author on uncertain points, unless we had space to discuss them, or at least to explain the grounds by which they are supported. One or two there are to which we may be tempted to recur, points of great present interest, and recently the subject of discussion; for the value we attach to this work is still more in the solution of great problems than in the general view of religion, which cannot be fully appreciated or obtain its full authority until it has been applied to the later periods of the Church. And these great problems are not in the doctrinal domain alone, but such as are provoked by the position of the Church in the world, the resistance she encounters, the society on which she acts. The social and the political character and influence of Christianity are here explained, as well as its organisation in the Church; and the lines of its whole career among mankind are fully and distinctly traced. Although the history of which Dr. Döllinger writes has possessed the same supreme importance for Christians in all ages, yet the present position of religion and science gives to this work a value which it could have possessed at no former period. As the facts to which it owes this importance are partly peculiar to Germany, and not as familiar to us as to the author's countrymen, and as they form, so to speak, the atmosphere in which it has been written, it will do more to explain the consequence we attribute to it if we describe the circumstances to which we allude, than if we devote our remaining pages to an account of the work itself.

It is about thirty years since that school of critics, which is best known in England by the name of Strauss, but which in Germany is called the School of Tübingen, was founded by Baur. The Rationalists of the eighteenth century had abundantly exercised their ingenuity in explaining away miracles, and in eliminating the supernatural element from history. They admitted the substantial truth of sacred history, but held that all that is marvellous could be explained by natural causes. The appearance of Jehovah on Mount Sinai meant a great thunder-storm; the tongues of fire at Pentecost were electrical sparks; the fetters of the Apostles

in prison were burst by an earthquake; the miraculous cures of the Gospel were performed by the help of medical resources, which the evangelist has omitted to record. Our Lord fed the five thousand by giving the example of distributing all the food that could be found; and the miracle of Cana was an ingenious artifice suited to the festive occasion. It is argued by the modern school of Rationalists that this mode of interpretation implies as great credulity as that of the supernaturalists. If nothing was too manifestly miraculous to be explained quite naturally, nothing could be too incredible to shake their faith in the natural portions of the narrative. The absurdity which they find in disbelieving miracles, and yet believing the sincerity and authenticity of narratives which are full of miracles, is obvious; and the progress of historical criticism in the hands of Wolf and Niebuhr provided them with a new and powerful auxiliary.

Wolf thought it very unlikely that in the time of Homer a perfect poem would be composed in obedience to all the rules devised by later critics, and exhibiting, together with all the originality and inventiveness of primitive times, the mature design of a more reflecting age. He examined the text closely, and maintained that the Homeric poems were gradually put together, that they grew rather than were composed, that they were the work, not of one man, but of a whole nation. Many popular legends, attached to different families and different places, were gradually united by men who had nothing to do with inventing them. The foundation of the argument was, that the poems were in existence at a time when they could not have been written.

Fifteen years later Niebuhr carried into history the mode of criticism which Wolf had first tried on poetry. The early legends and traditions of a nation might be preserved and collected in prose as well as in verse. History as well as religion might be clothed in mythical form; and this was most likely in a country where the old ballads had never been combined in a great national epic. It was therefore established, not only that an ancient book, apparently one in design and origin, might, by careful dissection, be divided into several distinct parts, but also that an historical narrative may be constructed out of legends, and that myths may be given for facts. So much was certain, that in primitive society the memory of important events is preserved by means of poems, and that they are invested with a mythical and supernatural appearance; whilst at a more advanced stage of civilisation the contrary process occurs, and stories, possessing no other value than their poetic merit, are trans-

lated into sober history. In other words, there are histories of which it may be shown that they consist of myths such as belong to the simple childhood of a people, but which, for various purposes, have been collected and given as facts. It must be remembered that both Wolf and Niebuhr were admitted to have proved at least their negative proposition; whether in each case the superstructure was solid or not did not affect the application of the same method of investigation to all other works of the kind, that is, to all poems and histories belonging to the mediæval period of any nation. Such a theory, raised upon grounds where no interest was affected but that of pure erudition, and matured therefore without any ulterior purpose whatever, was naturally a welcome instrument in the hands of a Rationalist theology.

That which was proved regarding Homer might be true of Moses. It might be that arguments analogous to those which showed the Iliad to be a collection of unconnected pieces would produce similar results on the book of Genesis. And if Livy united the poetical legends of the heroic age to adorn and to corroborate the patriotism of the Romans, why might not the history of Samson or of David have been compiled by a Jew from some equally praiseworthy motive? Accordingly, during the first quarter of the century, the Old Testament was the object of attacks which were soon extended to the New. What was settled concerning the holy books of the Jews might be found equally true with the holy books of the Christians. At the time when this began there was no Catholic theology in Germany, and Schleiermacher at Berlin was the great doctor of Protestantism. He was also the first of the more unscrupulous critics. He treated the history of the New Testament as Niebuhr had treated the history of Rome, and argued that the discrepancies of the several books were due to the fact that different traditions had been used by the different writers. But not only did the Gospels betray the existence of distinct traditions, but the epistles of St. Paul betray the hand of distinct authors. Many of the epistles were therefore rejected as spurious, and the Gospel narratives were to be credited according to the value of the traditions to which each fact could be traced. In this way the method used by the classical scholars was applied to the New Testament by the greatest authority among divines. Still it was but an external criticism, which might be allowed without surrendering the substance of the history of Redemption.

Next to Schleiermacher and Niebuhr, the greatest name in the literature of those days was Hegel. Disciples of the

first combined the criticism of the second with the philosophy of the last, and the result was the Tübingen school. When Wolf published his *Prolegomena*, the reigning metaphysician of the day, Fichte, informed him that he had already arrived, *a priori*, at the same conclusions. In the same way it may be said that the critics supplied the means of maintaining a position which, to Hegelians, was a necessary truth. In Hegel's system there is no personal God distinct from the universe, but a substance that realises itself only in the mind of each individual man. There is, therefore, no personal immortal soul, no free will, and no providence. God is impersonal Reason, subsisting in mankind collectively. History is the process by which He manifests and develops Himself,—a process consequently reasonable, intelligible, consecutive, in which all things are connected by a chain of inevitable causation, in which they succeed each other naturally and necessarily, in which there is only one single agent. In profane history this system of pantheism has promoted many brilliant researches by teaching men to seek the reason and connection of causes and effects, by insisting on the harmony of the parts, the reasonableness of the design, and the action of constant laws. But it explains only what lies in the sphere of nature, to the exclusion of the divine and of the human will. It denies the existence of supernatural causes, and the possibility of an interruption of the natural process. The evangelical history possesses, therefore, no reality, and in part no meaning. The Resurrection is impossible. The mystery of Incarnation is but an expression of the idea that man is actually God; it is not a particular act, but the perpetual mode of God's existence. He did not once become man, but is eternally man. He did not once assume human shape, but He can assume no other. Christ is the unity of human and divine nature. The history of His life is therefore a fable, and the history of His religion is perfectly natural. These two ideas are the whole patrimony of the Tübingen school. They endeavour to prove them by the aid of the theory of myths, and of Hegel's theory of natural continuity. Hegel himself invited this combination when he said: "As far as the historical, the external, the finite, are concerned, the sacred writings may be regarded in the same light as profane books;" and, "When it is said that the first man acted thus, this is a mode of speaking to the senses. The first man signifies in reality man as man; not a particular accidental individual among many, but man according to the notion of man" (*Werke*, xii. 217).

They proceed, therefore, as follows. In the natural sciences we consider only the operation of natural forces, and admit no interruption or suspension of them. An astronomer can reckon with the greatest certainty, for ages beforehand, the date of an eclipse or the appearance of a comet. A naturalist can with a fossil fragment construct an animal he has never seen or heard of. Why should history be exempt from laws which apply universally in other sciences? Besides, in profane history we reject every miraculous interruption of the natural order, however strong the evidence may be in its favour.* What probability is there that the Bible history is not subject to precisely the same rules? In an age when Protestantism had taken a low rationalistic character, this was a question not easily answered. Catholics are on a different footing, for they admit the possibility of miracles at all times, and at all times judge of their likelihood according to the evidence. Protestants, to be consistent, carry rationalism into Gospel history, whilst the Catholic system carries the reverence for the supernatural into profane, even into pagan history. Our canons of criticism cannot be quite the same. A Protestant either lowers sacred history to the level of profane, or else draws so decided a distinction between them, that no criticism is tolerated in the one, and no miracles are admitted in the other. A Catholic, instead of making so broad a separation, transfers to secular history much of the method he applies to religious history. We differ from the Protestant supernaturalists because the critical examination of the Bible, conducted in the spirit of religion, does not equally affect the foundation of our faith. For the tradition of the Church is both more ancient and more extensive than the writings of the New Testament. We differ from the rationalists because the analogy of sacred and profane history leads us, not to question the truth of the first, but to believe more readily the truth of the last. A Catholic has necessarily a more exalted notion of the import-

* "We cannot conceal from ourselves that it is, intrinsically speaking, difficult to defend the miracles of the New Testament, and to question those recorded by St. Augustine, and that that Father is right when he uses these, as the best authenticated, in order to prove the possibility of the others. Marvellous occurrences have happened to well-known persons, sometimes in the presence of crowds of people, and have been recorded officially; and yet our theologians, at least the Protestants, disbelieve in these miracles, and nevertheless condemn our criticism, because it thinks the occurrence of such fables equally possible in writings of which we are far less certain when, and by whom, and with what information they were composed" (Sybel's *Historische Zeitschrift*, 1860, iii. 141). The passage is from an article attributed to the ablest living representative of the Tübingen school, Zeller, the well-known author of a "History of the Philosophy of the Greeks."

ance and of the certainty of history than a Protestant ; and the well-known story of Raleigh, and the well-known saying of Johnson, are essentially anti-Catholic. For our religion rests not on the history of one age only, but on the knowledge of the history of many successive ages—not on the interpretation of Scripture alone, but on the authenticity of writings not inspired.

The Hegelian philosophy, not the critical method, is the great vice of the Tübingen school. They profess to go to work without preconceived notions, with nothing but the criterions used and found true in all historical science. Their peculiarity, they say, is only in the instrument they employ, not in the point they start from, or in any definite end. This may be true of Niebuhr writing on the history of Rome, or Müller on the history of Greece ; but it is false in the case of a disciple of Hegel examining the New Testament. Before starting he has arrived at a perfectly definite conclusion, to which all his labour is secondary, and to which it inevitably tends. Niebuhr set about examining Livy, wondering whether he should find him right or wrong ; but a Hegelian judges beforehand that the Gospel narrative must be untrue. For if miracles are impossible, a history which is full of miracles must be fabulous, and men who recount the miracles they have seen or heard of must be impostors or dupes. Herodotus may have a fabulous story, yet his credit is not destroyed when he describes the battle of Marathon ; but it would be perfectly ridiculous to apply to the *Arabian Nights* the same canons. The assertion that they, and they alone, are unprejudiced judges, is the great imposture of the new school of critics. They pretend that they can inquire sincerely into the truth of a narrative *a posteriori*, which is in their eyes *a priori* incredible. They claim to be without any theological bias, and they begin by denying the truth of the religion whose history they are studying. Assuming, therefore, the principle that the foundation of Christianity is a perfectly natural and intelligible process, they necessarily rejected as fabulous a large portion of the life of Christ, His miraculous birth, His resurrection and ascension, all the miracles for which no plausible natural interpretation could be found, and most of the discourses recorded by St. John. It is therefore admitted, that much of the Gospel history is not literally true. This Strauss endeavoured to make more probable, independently of the argument against miracles, by the most ingenious use of the discrepancy between St. John and the other Evangelists, and of the imperfect agreement of these among themselves.

This, the attack on the old Gospel harmonies, is the most brilliant part of his book ; and it cannot be said that the explanations that used to be given can be admitted in the presence of his skilful argument. But this was only the first, the destructive, part of his work. If the Gospels relate things which are not true, how did these things come to be believed ? If these stories are not historical, how did they arise ? The answer was borrowed from Niebuhr : the Gospel history is full of myths. That is to say, it is composed in great part of poetical stories that have been gradually and unconsciously formed, and are not the work of individuals, and which are founded neither in fact nor in pure fancy, but are the product of certain religious ideas. They arose, therefore, under the influence of a religious purpose and interest. What, then, is the foundation they have in common, by which their general agreement is explained ? Strauss answers, that they proceed from the attempt of the Christians to show that the prophecies of the Old Testament, and especially the notion of the Messiah, are fulfilled in their founder. This is his solution of the problem presented by the existence of the New Testament and of the Christian religion. He discards great part of the evangelical account, and of the rest explains only that in which the different accounts fully agree. But he does nothing to explain the different character of the different Gospels, and in this the others went beyond him. They say that there is not only a common Christian interest at the root of all the accounts, but that each writer has a particular purpose and character of his own. They found an intention in the selection and arrangement of the matter in the several Evangelists, and especially in the longer discourses, which could not be the product of a legend. The next problem, therefore, was to find out the various motives and designs which lay hidden in the different works. If they are the result of differences of opinion among the early Christians, and memorials of their controversies, then they give a new light by the internal evidence they afford of the state of the Church. The whole literary activity of Baur was devoted to the elucidation of the parties which divided the Christians of the Apostolic age, in which he finds a key to the diversities in the writings of the New Testament. Of course these are exaggerated and multiplied as much as possible. Now, both for the formation of myths, and for the development of controversy, time is required ; consequently the books of the New Testament must have arisen very gradually, some of them late in the second century. The chief argument for this is the asser-

tion that Gnosticism arose only in the time of Hadrian, and that the sects which are alluded to in the New Testament cannot be distinct from it; so that the epistles of St. Peter, St. James, St. Jude, the pastoral epistles, and the epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians, belong to the second century, and are not the work of the Apostles. The Gospel of St. John in particular betrays traces of Montanist and other controversies which prevailed long after the death of the Apostle.

One half of the New Testament being thus declared the result of the religious conflicts of the second century, similar conflicts in the apostolic age are assumed as the groundwork and explanation of those apostolic writings whose authenticity is admitted. St. Peter, St. James, and St. John are represented as the real Jewish disciples of Christ, whose doctrines were nearly those of the Essenes, and of the later Ebionites. In opposition to their narrow Judaic Christianity, Hellenistic Jews introduced a more generous universal doctrine. St. Stephen was the founder of the new school; St. Paul its most energetic defender. He brought the antagonism to a crisis by asserting that belief in the Resurrection was enough for salvation, without the observation of the Jewish ritual. Rejected by the Jewish party, he became the Apostle of the Gentiles, and the opposite party ceaselessly strove to impede him by their epistles and emissaries, and by personal imputations. The authentic memorials of this conflict are, on the side of St. Paul, the epistles to the Galatians, the Corinthians, and to the Romans (with the exception of the last two chapters); and of the judaising party, the Apocalypse, the only remaining work of a personal disciple of Christ, which attacks in the Nicolaites the disciples of St. Paul, and insists upon the number of the twelve Apostles in order to represent his claims to the office as unfounded. All the remaining books of the New Testament are spurious, and belong to the later periods of the controversy. In the epistle to the Romans, and in his last journey to Jerusalem, St. Paul tried in vain to conciliate his adversaries; but in Rome his epistle and his martyrdom had a conciliatory effect, which is expressed in the legend which united the two Apostles in their last labours and in their death. The Gospel of St. Luke was written in the interest of St. Paul; that of St. Matthew, about the year 140, in the Jewish interest, and such passages as xxviii. 19 are interpolations, and inconsistent with the spirit of the original. But the success of St. Paul in his mission to the heathen overcame at last the resistance of the Petrine party. They surrendered

the strict observance of the law on condition of preserving the commandments of Noah, and they accepted baptism instead of circumcision. In consideration of which concessions, the Pauline theology consented to give up the strict doctrine of justification, and thus neutralised the antagonism of faith and works. This process of conciliation is marked in the epistle to the Hebrews, and the remaining epistles bearing the name of St. Paul, and in the Gospel of St. Mark, on the part of the Gentile Christians; and in the epistles attributed to St. James, St. Peter, and St. Jude, on the part of the Jews. The opposition was carried on by the Marcionites, and in the pseudo-Clementine writings. The definitive reconciliation and oblivion of the past is expressed in the Acts of the Apostles, which suppress the conflict altogether. The highest product of the union are the Epistles and Gospel of St. John, written at the time of the Paschal controversy, in which the Jewish doctrine of the Messiah is developed with the aid of Greek speculation, and under the influence of Philo to the notion of the Logos; and the religion of charity signifies the filial harmony of all parties. In this manner the Catholic Church took its rise, towards the close of the second century. "Professor Baur," said one of his colleagues, "applies to the history of the Apostolic age the experience of his university life. St. Peter is a venerable professor, whose dignity and importance are attacked by an emancipated student; and St. Paul is the ambitious and restless competitor, who tries to take the seat of his old master."

If any body should say, that in a matter of so much importance as the writings of the Apostles, there could be no doubt respecting their authorship, the answer is that the *Εἰκὼν βασιλική* was attributed to King Charles immediately after his death. Nor was it any reproach to compose books, and attribute them to men in defence of whose opinions they were written. It was precisely the same case as the orations of the classical historians, or the Socratic conversations in Plato. Again, it might be urged that the first centuries of the Christian era were a highly civilised age, in which the ordinary conditions on which the rise of myths depends are totally wanting. This is met by referring to the legend of Simon Magus, and to the innumerable spurious acts of the early martyrs.

In this way the rise of Christianity is explained. But it still remains to be shown how the person of Christ came to be clothed with so many foreign ideas. As there is no testimony of an eye-witness except the Apocalypse, which

is not an historical book, it is necessary to consider what elements there were in the age in which He appeared which could give rise to the accounts of His life and doctrine. As there is nothing in the history of the world sudden or unprepared, Christianity must necessarily be the religious form which suited the age in which it appeared, and was the result of a long previous process. The universal monarchies, the destruction of national characters and of national religions, had prepared the way for a universal faith. It arose accordingly without delay, as soon as the Romans had achieved the conquest of the world. It was the religion that corresponded to the political state of the time, by which the national exclusiveness even of Judaism had been broken. It contained nothing which had not already appeared in some shape or other. One portion of its substance was supplied by the Greek philosophy. The process of regeneration, which culminates in Christianity, was begun by Socrates. His practical reflective philosophy, the self-knowledge on which he insisted, is essentially Christian; and the inquiry into the supreme good which occupied the later schools, turns upon the great problem of the Christian faith. The ethics of Aristotle, of Cicero, Seneca, Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius, anticipate nearly all its moral teaching. Paganism led therefore to the very threshold of the new religion. Its formation was the result of a process extending from the appearance of Socrates, during six hundred years, to the composition of the Gospel of St. John. The notion of the person of Christ, a subordinate element in the system, came from the Jews. It was simply assumed that the Messiah had appeared, the fulfilment of the prophecies was referred to Him, and the rich treasures of Hellenic speculation supplied the substance of His teaching. In the Gospel of St. Matthew the person has less importance than the doctrine, and the doctrine reduces itself to very little. It consists, in fact, of no more than the Sermon on the Mount, and the substance of the sermon are the beatitudes; and the only characteristic and original idea is the beatitude of the poor. Among the Jews, the Essenes approached very near to the later Christian system, with their poverty, charity, and communism; whilst the Alexandrian Jews combined heathen philosophy with the Mosaic system by means of allegorical interpretation, and prepared the speculative part of Christianity.

So that there was a striving on the part both of paganism and of Judaism to approach each other; all that the Christians afterwards believed already existed; and the

fusion took place when the disciples of Jesus declared that the Messiah had appeared, that the Jewish prophecies were accomplished, and that His doctrine was addressed to all mankind. Christianity satisfies all the hopes, the wants, the aspirations, and the speculation of antiquity. It is enough to know what these were, in order to tell the form which the successful religion would inevitably take.

There are those who estimate the danger and importance of a theory in inverse ratio to the enormity of the conclusions to which it leads. Where there is much that is apparently fanciful and absurd, they will suppose that there can be little to try faith. This would be a very erroneous view of the real significance of the criticism of the school of Tübingen. For it is at the same time the legitimate and natural result of the Protestant system from the time of the Reformation, and the ripest fruit of the metaphysical and historical science of Germany. In all this there is nothing more arbitrary than that which has constantly been insisted upon by Protestants, the notion that St. Peter never came to Rome. If the evidence on which that belief is founded is not conclusive, there is nothing certain in the history of the origin of Christianity. So long as Protestants hold fast to its denial, and to their disbelief of miracles generally, the victory is with their more consistent adversaries. They may be confuted in detail; but their principles of investigation and their conclusions cannot substantially be impugned. It has been one of the most remarkable effects of this controversy to produce a strong conservative reaction among Protestant commentators, a revision of the theory of miracles, and a surrender of the old opinion against the presence of St. Peter in Rome.

The German intellect can boast of no greater achievement than the creation of the critical and reconstructive methods, of which the school of Baur represents the highest development. It is, in all other departments of learning, the great instrument of the discoveries by which they have attained their supremacy in literature. By means of its agency they have effected a revolution both in classical and in mediæval history. The principles and the faculties by which these triumphs have been achieved are, to at least an equal degree, in the possession of the Tübingen critics. In dialectical skill and in erudition none of their Protestant adversaries can cope with them, and several of the party have acquired in other branches of learning a durable reputation. Neither Mosheim nor Neander can be compared either in critical sagacity or in classical and patristic know-

ledge with Baur. Zeller is the author of the best history of ancient philosophy. Schwegler, another conspicuous member of the school, has written the best history of Rome. Strauss has written on the sixteenth century works of enduring value. It is not therefore surprising that a school composed of such men should have held their own against Protestant Germany. They have been victorious in many an encounter with inferior adversaries, and the names of those by whom unsuccessful refutations have been attempted are to be found among Catholics as well.* Their tendency is too much in harmony both with the faith and knowledge of the day not to be gradually adopted wherever rationalism is found, which derives from them a scientific energy it never possessed before. The first symptoms of their influence may already be discerned in England, and its effect will be greater here than abroad. For Anglicanism both holds more closely to the Bible than German Protestantism, and has fewer means of defending it. It will neither be able to avoid nor to sustain the shock.

These are the facts, in the present condition of the religious world, which give to the work of which we have been speaking an almost unexampled importance. It places before the destructive rationalism of the day a complete, harmonious, and detailed picture of the Apostolic age, drawn with an abundance of ecclesiastical knowledge, a power of combination, and a soundness of criticism, to which neither the modern rationalists nor their opponents in Germany have any pretension. That which in the older writers afforded scope for the successful assaults of the critics, is here purified and corrected with all the appliances of modern learning. No difficulty is avoided, no point surrendered, no inconsistency tolerated, no problem, we might almost say, left without its solution. Without expressly disputing with the infidels in points of detail, it supplies a complete refutation of their works, and replies not to their attacks only, but to all that have been made against the belief which the Church has of her origin; thus satisfying not only a special requirement of our time, but what must, at all times, be the chief desire of a Catholic, κτήμά τε ἐς αἰὲ μᾶλλον ἢ ἀγώνισμα ἐς τὸ παραχρήμα.

* An instance of this kind, in some recent articles of the *Correspondant*, can only be explained by the evident fact that the author has not made himself acquainted with the chief works and opinions of the school.

THE GRAND REMONSTRANCE.*

DR. FORSTER is a clever man and an industrious historian, inquisitive of old records, and sagacious in sifting facts; but he fails when he comes to sift principles, when the power of distinguishing is most necessary. "When a doubt is propounded," says an author whom he is fond of quoting, "you must learn to distinguish, and show wherein a thing holds, and wherein it doth not hold: *aye* or *no* never answered any question. The not distinguishing where things should be distinguished, and the not confounding where things should be confounded, is the cause of all the mistakes in the world."

Hume has with considerable truth drawn a distinction between the noble political character of the men who defended the liberties of England against the encroachments of the Stuarts and their narrow sectarian bigotry. Dr. Forster's object is to mix up again these two questions, and to confound the religion and politics of the time into one mess. That "most memorable state-paper," the Grand Remonstrance, "demonstrates," he says, "by its close and powerful reasoning how inseparable religion and politics had become, and how each was to be stabbed only through the other." In other words, the political history of the Long Parliament is a religious demonstration of the incompatibility of Popery with civil liberties, and of the necessity of Puritanism and Protestantism to the preservation of English freedom. The argument is so familiar to the English mind that its monstrous fallacies will not excite remark. But its fallacies are monstrous nevertheless. One who was present during the debates, and whose learning, speeches, and writings had done more than most men's to forward the cause of liberty,—one who is quite a representative (like Burke) of the scientific statesmen of England,—had from the facts before him come to a conclusion widely different. Selden's notion was that religion was the mere pretext for the fight for liberty. "The very *arcanum*," he says, "of pretending religion in all wars is, that something may be found out in which all men may have interest. In this the groom has as much interest as the lord; . . . religion is equal to both." Again: "The soldiers say they fight for honour, when the truth is, they have their honour in their pocket. And they mean the same thing that pretend to fight for religion."

* *The Debates on the Grand Remonstrance, November and December 1641; with an Introductory Essay on English Freedom under Plantagenet and Tudor Sovereigns.* By John Forster, LL.D. London: Murray.

The fact is, that liberty of itself is too rare and colourless a medium to excite any great passion. It is the atmosphere of free thought and action; but who ever heard of an enthusiasm for an atmosphere? Pure air is the last luxury which the solid citizen thinks of acquiring. It is sacrificed to every corporal necessity, to every whim, to every desire for warmth and snugness. The poor man has almost to be paid for setting his windows open, or allowing his sewerage to be drained away. Some of the Sheffield filers, whose business reduces their lives to an average hardly above thirty years, refuse to allow their fraternity to wear magnetised masks, which would make the employment healthy, because as it is so much higher wages are earned. Liberty is treated in the same way by all persons who are engaged in trade, or in otherwise making their fortunes. Freedom is not the object of any unmixed and disinterested passion, except among a limited number of the most refined and most educated spirits of the age. It is their task to gain the sympathies of the people for liberty, not by setting it forth in its abstract nakedness, formless and impalpable, but in the strongly marked and solid forms of religious liberty,—the liberty of purse, of person, of the press, of the platform, of trade, of teaching, of tippling,—of any thing, in short, whose existence is prized by one party and assailed by another. Nay, even the choice spirits who are the natural leaders in a struggle for liberty, those refined and cultivated men who alone can contemplate and love liberty for itself, even their power is indefinitely augmented by hugging to their hearts some one or more of those objects which are capable of moving the passions, and of rousing party spirit. We will not deny, then, that the parliamentary leaders who secured to us our liberties by the *Declaration of Rights* and by the *Grand Remonstrance* were religious enthusiasts, even fanatics. We will not deny that their fanaticism and enthusiasm were the most powerful levers to heave their stagnant powers into action, and to rouse them to fight for liberty. But we absolutely deny the necessary connection between the struggle for liberty and the peculiar form of religion that those men professed. During the struggle many of them went off to America to secure there the liberties which they despaired of obtaining in England. Cromwell himself, at the close of the debate on the *Grand Remonstrance*, told Lord Falkland, that if the vote had gone against them, he and many other honest men he knew would have sold all they had that very morning, and never have seen England more. The pilgrim fathers of New England were the very type of the

ruck of the patriots of the Rebellion. And the liberties which they founded in America are therefore a type of the liberties which they desired for England; and this liberty was, freedom for Puritanism and Puritans, coupled with the severest restrictions on the liberties of every one who did not obey without questioning that narrow rule; so far had the objects which gave enthusiasm to their passion for liberty distorted their affections, and obscured their intellectual conception of liberty itself.

The real champions of liberty at that period were, we fear, men of a sceptical turn of mind. Like Henry IV. of France, or Barneveldt in the Netherlands, the men who sowed the seeds of the struggle for constitutional liberties in England were persons of any thing but orthodox views in the estimation either of Protestants or of Catholics. Men like Selden directed the current of the forces which they found in action. If the force of Puritanism had really been directed by Puritans, and had resulted in founding an ideal Puritanical state, England would have groaned under an iron despotism, and a contemptible system of *surveillance* and *garde à vue* (we are obliged to use French words, because the humanity of the English language retains no equivalent terms) to which the police systems of Naples and Berlin would have been mere bugbears. We should have been forced to justify our daily bills of fare to the parochial presbytery by texts culled from Scripture, and to undergo severe penances for having buttons sewn on to our small-clothes on the Sabbath. Fortunately for us, however, the blind forces of Puritanism were directed by men who hated and despised Puritanism in their hearts, and who took good care that its offspring should in nowise resemble the parent,—if we are forced to admit any such relation between Puritanism and liberty.

But in the midst of this perturbed and tumultuous search for a partial freedom,—partial because it implied the subjection and slavery of all who opposed not liberty itself, but those opinions for which liberty was being sought,—there was at work a spirit quite hostile to the Puritanism which did the rough work of the struggle. Nothing can be more contrary to the puritanical spirit than the historical one. The Puritanism of that day had no history; its life depended on the negation of the vitality of any former kind of Christianity; it was the new way of the private spirit as opposed to that of public and traditional authority. But the political leaders of the party took good care not to apply their religious method to their essays in politics. Instead of appealing

to their private spirit, or to their own deductions from supposed first principles, like the French revolutionists, they drew all their weapons "from all the old laws and usages of the land, all the old ways and precedents of Parliament, all the ancient traditions of the rights of the three estates," stored up "in records, charters, old books, and parchment-rolls." Antiquarians, like Selden and Sir Simonds d'Ewes, became the mouthpieces of Parliament, and the chairmen of committees; and the "vouching of a record" "not only gave satisfaction, but ended a weighty and perplexed dispute." In politics the Puritans acknowledged and acted upon the very principle which they were so often in vain challenged to acknowledge in religion. In politics every thing was settled by an appeal to the fathers. In religion the fathers were no better than children, and no one had a right to question the illumination of the private spirit. "The Puritan," says Selden, "would be judged by the word of God: but if he would speak clearly he means himself, but he is ashamed to say so; and he would have me believe him before a whole Church that has read the word of God as well as he." Dr. Forster would fain perpetuate the Puritan's confusion of ideas. He would persuade us that we cannot separate the struggle for liberty "from the Protestant reformation, and its overthrow of Roman Catholic bondage;" and yet, in his preliminary essay, he traces the foundations of all our liberties to the efforts of our Catholic forefathers, and speaks of Archbishop Stephen de Langton as one who, "at a time apparently the most unfavourable for the growth of freedom, had impelled existing discontents, which but for him might have wasted themselves in casual conflict, to the establishment of that deep and broad distinction between a free and despotic monarchy of which our history never afterwards lost the trace."

We may leave to orthodox Anglicans the task of showing that their spirit is not hostile to liberty in an equal degree with the spirit of Popery; for this would follow from Dr. Forster's principles. He does not identify the love of liberty with Protestantism in general, but with Puritanism, though it of course suits his purpose to use the more general word, in order to touch the sympathies of a larger class of readers, and to disarm the opposition of those who would be offended at the exclusive claim that he ought to make for Puritanism. But if we pass over this consideration, as scarcely touching the substance of our argument, it is still worth while to inquire into the reasons that have made it possible for our writers thus to contrast the cause of liberty with the cause

of Catholicism, with which in its cradle it was so intimately allied, and to confound it with the cause of Protestantism and Puritanism, as if liberty was the child of the Reformation, inseparable from Protestantism, and incompatible with any other form of religion. The true cause, we fear, must be sought in the conduct of the English Catholics in the 16th and the first half of the 17th centuries. When the feudal system, with its seeds of freedom, fell to pieces, and the three kings, whom Lord Bacon calls the *tres magi*—Ferdinand of Spain, Lewis XI. of France, and Henry VII.—substituted kingcraft and personal prerogative for feudal and constitutional rights, the Catholics naturally acquiesced in the new system. In England, indeed, Henry lived by the Church; out of lawyers and churchmen exclusively he chose his friends and councillors; and the Church protected him, as it recently patronised Lewis Napoleon in the first years of his power. The falling-away of Henry VIII. and his successors from the Church did not bring the system of kingcraft into discredit, even though it was enlisted on the Protestant side. The Catholics never thought of recurring to the old constitution for protection, but simply imagined the substitution of one person for another on the throne. On the Continent the fidelity of the Spanish throne, which had succeeded in Charles V. to the Imperial crown of Germany, and of the French, decided the Church in allying herself with the new system of kingcraft, to protect her against the brutality of the revolution that called itself reformation. The intolerable persecution which the English crown inflicted upon the English Catholics was met, not by appeals to the prescriptive rights guaranteed by the English constitution, but by appeals to foreign princes, and by plans for finding some substitute for the heretical prince,—some one who would persecute Protestants instead of Catholics. When the Stuarts succeeded the Tudors, another party besides the Catholics became subject to the persecution of the Crown; and on the succession of the second Stuart monarch, with his Catholic queen, the Puritans found themselves even more disliked and disturbed than the Catholics. The effect of this change upon the Catholics was most unfortunate. Brought up to acquiesce in the established system of kingcraft, forward in confessing, like other courtiers, that it would be the height of presumption in private men to attempt to fathom the sacred mysteries of State, and therefore looking with mystic awe upon the sovereign as something akin to divinity, they looked for no higher guarantee of their liberties than the personal character and the per-

sonal favour of the king. Impoverished by seventy years of spoliation, they accepted with gratitude, not only the remissions with which Charles indulged them, but the rights of retaliation which he granted to them. They had smarted for three parts of a century under the most unjust laws that even a servile parliament could frame, in obedience to the impulses of terror and dislike. When prospects of liberty opened to them, instead of seizing the opportunity to render all such laws for the future quite impossible, they cheerfully acquiesced in the prolongation of the system, provided it was applied to other persons instead of themselves, and provided they were made the instruments of carrying it out. The Forest of Dean was broken up, and leases of it granted to Catholics, who were glad to indemnify themselves for a long spoliation by dividing the spoils of the national property. The celebration of Mass, though illegal, was connived at; but woe to the Protestant who declined attending at his parish-church because he thought it idolatry to bow to the altar. He was punished first by fine, and on a repetition of his refusal by transportation. The Catholics were singled out for special grants of monopolies. "They grew," says Clarendon, "not only secret contrivers but public professed promoters of, and ministers in, the most grievous projects; as that of soap, formed, framed, and executed by almost a corporation of that religion." Windebank, the Secretary of State, was their tool. They had a resident nuncio, under whom the most influential of their nobility, gentry, and clergy held secret convocations after the manner of a parliament, which levied taxes, secretly stored up arms and munitions, and almost obtained from the court a commission, under private conditions and instructions, for the raising of soldiers.

Thus were the Catholics of England impelled by their prejudices and resentments to enlist themselves under the banner of a failing cause, and to gain the eternal enmity of the side that was destined to win, and that ought to have secured their sympathies, because its political principles were an inheritance from the most illustrious statesmen and churchmen of old Catholic England, and were logically deducible from the system of Catholic morals. The Jesuits saw clearly enough at the beginning of the dispute that it would be their interest in England to join the Parliament against the King; but it was made impossible, not only by the feelings of the English Catholics, but by the interests of the order abroad. The Society could not afford to conciliate English parliamentarism, which had not yet gained the day,

by the sacrifice of its alliance with the regnant and triumphant Continental kingcraft. So the clear visions of the leading English Jesuits were as useless as the predictions of Cassandra, and they survive only in some obscure journals of houses of the Society, that may still be read in the Royal Library of Brussels. It was impossible that the English Catholics could at that time be forced by any amount of reasoning to join the Parliamentary side, though at the beginning of the controversy the Parliamentary leaders bid high for their support. But passions ran too high to allow the voice of reason to be heard. When Henrietta gave a gold chain that supported her Agnus to some poor women in distress at Exeter, the story ran that she was rebuked by her confessor "because they were heretics." The scorn of the Catholics for Puritanism forbade their making common cause with the Puritans in the most justifiable and most successful struggle for liberty which the world has ever beheld; and for that scorn they have since paid the penalty, in being the only considerable body systematically and persistently excluded from the liberties secured in the struggle.

It appears to us that this chapter of the History of England contains a lesson of deep import for the Italian and Continental Catholics of the present day. It shows that the security which Catholics require is not the personal favour of sovereigns, but the safeguard of habits, constitutions, and laws. It shows that a chivalrous personal devotion may sacrifice the liberty of religion, not of the present generation only, but of multitudes yet unborn. It teaches us not unduly to import domestic feelings into politics, not to be respecters of persons, but to be inflexible in demanding, even at the apparent sacrifice of personal gratitude and loyalty, the solid guarantee of universal laws and constitutional sanctions. We have no right to sacrifice the prospects of religion to our devotion to any family, however historical, even though its blood be "the blood of ages." Neither have we a right for the supposed good of religion to make ourselves the instruments or the supporters of a lawless tyranny, simply because for the present it favours us and oppresses only those whom we like to see depressed. For the time will come when either the arbitrary power, to save itself, will turn against us, or when it will be overthrown by its indignant subjects, and we shall be involved in its ruin. If the English Catholics under Charles I. had profited by the lessons of seventy years, and had refused to share in enforcing against others a system which they had found intolerable when applied to themselves, they would

either have obliged the king, seeing how weakly he was supported, to yield without an appeal to arms, or they would have shared the fruits of the Parliamentary victory, and secured liberty to the Church in England, while nearly a fourth part of England was yet Catholic. And the example of the Catholics in England might have encouraged the Catholics of the Continent to refuse to embark all their hopes in the boat that was manned and steered by the representatives of kingcraft and Cæsarism. The old alliance between Catholicism and the moribund *ancien régime* is the fruitful cause of most of the present griefs of the Church. If there was any where in the world a powerful independent body of Catholics, who had never been allied with that *régime*, who had ever been foremost in defending the liberties founded by Catholic churchmen and statesmen in mediæval times, and who were now the recognised champions of law and traditional freedom, the temporal position and hopes of the Church would be very different from what they are.

THE POLITICAL SYSTEM OF THE POPES.—No. III.

THE Papal system of states gradually extended itself, till in the thirteenth century it reached its culminating point, when its great semicircle encompassed the states of the German Emperors. The Slaves and Magyars of the East had joined the Latin nations of the West, and the Sicilian Empire of the South was the connecting link between them. But after the thirteenth century the East began to detach itself. After the intimate alliance of King Prumysl Ottocar with Otho IV., the Pope recognised Bohemia as an independent principality, no longer subject to the Roman See; and the union of the Servians and Bulgarians with Rome only served to manifest their inconstancy and political imbecility. The East was in process of disintegration, in spite of the efforts of Hungary under the Arpades, and of the Anjous under Louis the Great, to become the centres of an Eastern Empire. A like effort had been also made by Prumysl Ottocar II., the celebrated adversary of Rodolph of Hapsburg; but he scorned to accept the German crown, and refused to lean upon Rome, and was in consequence destroyed by the Germans. Afterwards the Hapsburgs in Austria, the Anjous in Hungary, and the Luxemburgs in Bohemia, endeavoured to set up a great Eastern Empire, in which the Hapsburgs were

at last successful. This house owed its power chiefly to the Popes, and its influence over the election of the German kings to the divisions of the Germans; and though the Bull of Charles IV. abolished this interference in law, it still continued in fact.

The kingdom of Sicily continued to be the most important member, not only of the ecclesiastical system, but of all the political systems of Europe. From it the imperial system received its heaviest blow, and from it also the Papal system received that concussion which at length threw it out of gear, as we will relate as briefly as we can.

The Norman kingdom in Sicily was a prey to disputes more deadly than those which racked the English kingdom of William the Conqueror. William I. of Sicily, who had beheld three of his sons go to the grave before him, and had grown prematurely old through the dissipations of his youth, attempted to throw off the vassalage due to the Pope, and thus caused Pope Adrian to form a coalition with the Byzantine and German Emperors against him, which reduced the Norman crown to its original condition. During the consequent disturbances William slew his own son, and was then succeeded by William II., his younger son. Under him the Normans once more endeavoured, but in vain, to subdue the Byzantine Empire. On this Henry of Hohenstaufen, son of Frederic Barbarossa, married Constanza, daughter of King Roger (1154), and the succession of the Norman kingdom was secured to their children (1185). But after the death of William II. the Normans altered the succession in favour of Count Tancred, the grandson of King Roger I., whom that monarch had disinherited out of hatred to his own son Roger, in favour of Tancred's uncle, William I. In 1189 the Sicilian Parliament recognised Tancred as king, and he was instituted by the Pope in 1190, and crowned at Palermo. In consequence the war of succession broke out, and was conducted with the utmost vehemence and perfidy by Henry IV., who had succeeded his father in the empire in 1190. But Henry's lineage, and the whole house of Hohenstaufen, were afterwards destroyed by the Germans, at least as tragically as they had destroyed the Norman line. We have a contemporary anticipation of the future of Sicily in the pages of Hugo Falcandus, the Norman historian. He had not much hope of it. The different nations settled there—Longobards, Greeks, Normans, Saracens, and Italians—had as yet found no common centre. The love of the Apulians for change, and their cowardice in the field, the quarrels of the Normans with the Saracens, and the fears of a Saracen insurrection, made the

prospect gloomy. But the historian was dead before his fears were accomplished.

After Tancred had been acknowledged in Sicily and Apulia, Roger, Count of Adria, called in King Henry. But the first expedition of the Germans was unsuccessful, and the Count of Adria was defeated at Ascoli. And when Henry, after he had become emperor, put in his wife's claims, he found Naples too strong for him, and was obliged to retreat. Constanza herself fell into Tancred's hands, but was left free to rejoin her husband; and the Germans, overcome both by generosity and by arms, were forced to evacuate the kingdom. And now the Italian policy of the Popes came clearly to light. The prospect of the union of the crown of Lower Italy with the power that ruled the central and upper provinces, and that wore the crowns of Lombardy, Germany, and Arles, necessarily caused great uneasiness for the fate of Italy, and particularly of Rome, and for the liberty of the Church; and the actual accomplishment of this union under Henry VI. led to the enunciation of the fixed principle that the union of the imperial crown with the vassal crown of Sicily was unlawful, and that every effort must be made to prevent the prolongation of such a state of things. Frederic Barbarossa was meditating the conquest of Sicily in 1162, and made large promises to the Genoese in case of its success. In 1164 he sold to a Genoese the crown of Sardinia for 40,000 silver marks, and also sold it to Pisa for 13,000 golden lire. When the expedition against Sicily was really put in hand, an imperial patent from Gelnhausen secured to Pisa one half of the harbours and territories of Palermo, Messina, Salerno, and Naples. Luckily for Henry Tancred died, February 20, 1194, a short time after his eldest son Roger, and both were buried in one grave. Tancred's younger son, William, who succeeded him, was under the regency of his mother, Sibylla. The kingdom was split by dissenting factions, and just at this moment Henry obtained the sinews of war by the ransom paid by the English for the liberation of King Richard of the Lion-heart. Henry proceeded in person to Genoa, and purchased the assistance of the republic by promising to it Syracuse and the Val di Noto, and declaring that when he had the island he would only keep the honour and title, and leave all the profits to the Genoese. "As for me, I cannot remain there with my Germans, but you and your successors will reside there, and the kingdom will belong more to you than to me."

But after Messina had fallen, he put off fulfilling his promises till he should also have Palermo; and after Palermo

had surrendered, he could not do so till the Genoese ambassadors had received full powers; and when this also was done, "Know ye," he said, "that I shall give you nothing in the kingdom of Sicily, nor shall you share its ownership with me, so you need not take any trouble about the possession of it. But if you will undertake an expedition against the King of Aragon" (Alphonso II., whose daughter Constantia was afterwards the first wife of King Frederic II.), "I will transfer his dominion to you, and it shall be wholly yours." This gives us a clue to the resolution of Alphonso III. to place the crown of Aragon under the protection of the Pope. The Genoese aided in the conquest of Naples, Salerno, and Messina. Tancred's crown, with his son and his widow, fell into the power of the Hohenstaufen. Tancred's noble conduct towards Constanza had merited a similar treatment for his own family; but the Emperor put them on trial for life or death, December 25-30, 1194. King William was blinded and otherwise mutilated, and imprisoned at Kohenems, near Bregenz, where he died, probably in 1198. His mother and sister were incarcerated in Alsace; the bodies of his father and brother were torn from their grave and beheaded; the Norman grandees were mutilated, buried or burnt alive; the kingdom given up to the Germans; and then proclamation was made that, by the endeavours of the Emperor, Sicily was brought into a better state. After this Henry returned to Germany, to change the elective monarchy into an hereditary one. The electors had already vested the succession in the imperial house, when an insurrection broke out in Sicily. The Pope excommunicated the haughty prince who respected neither right nor breeding. Henry hastened to Italy, and his path was deluged with blood; Constanza herself rose against him, and was thrown into prison. At last the tyrant caught a fever at the siege of Castro Giovanni, and died at Messina, September 28, 1197, aged thirty-two. His only son, Frederic II., heir of Sicily in right of his mother, had been recognised as king by the German princes in 1196, but he was now to lose both crowns. Duke Markwald, Henry's most faithful follower, was ready to swear that Frederic was not his son. The boy's own uncle, Philip, became a candidate, first for the German, and then for the Italian crown. It was entirely to the Pope that Frederic owed his life, his liberty, and the kingdom of Sicily. We have already related how he and his family perished.

After the fall of the Hohenstaufen the empire sank lower than ever, while the French power was continually developing in Italy. And now, quite unexpectedly, a blow was struck in

Sicily which convulsed all the south of Christendom, and gave its policy an entirely new turn. March 30, 1282, witnessed the Sicilian Vespers, and the revolt of the kingdom from Charles of Anjou. When all the Sicilians had followed the example of Palermo, and had murdered all the French in the island, the chiefs of the rebellion unfurled the banner of St. Peter; and it was when the Roman Peter refused to help them, that they turned instead to the more mundane Peter of Aragon. Pope Martin IV. declared in favour of the King of Naples, the vassal of the Roman See, and against the tributary King of Aragon, Peter III., whom he deposed in 1284, giving Aragon, Valentia, and Catalonia, to that pretender to so many crowns, Charles of Valois, second son of Philip III., King of France. The three crowns were to remain for ever separated from France, Castile, and England, and to remain with Charles and his descendants, who were required to swear fealty to the Pope, and to pay him annually 500*l.* as quit-rent. Sicily was to be reconquered by Charles of Anjou, as well as Aragon, against which the Christian world was invited to aid the French arms by a crusade. But both undertakings failed; so that from the Sicilian Vespers dates the beginning of the dissolution of the political system of the Popes, as well as the cessation of the crusades to the East. All the maritime states in the Spanish and Italian basin of the Mediterranean were overwhelmed with the Sicilian flood. The strife was bloody; but Naples failed to conquer Sicily, and France to overcome Aragon. King Pedro died in the midst of the struggle, and his successor, Alphonso III., took possession of the crown of Aragon at Saragossa, with the words, "I accept the crown, neither from the Church, nor against her." But when the Papal institution of the sovereign was left out, the Cortes united against him, and compelled him to recognise the privileges of the parliament, and to swear not to violate the constitution. Thus Alphonso in ceasing to be subject to the Pope, in 1288, became subject to the Cortes.

All efforts to isolate the Sicilians, or to gain them over to Naples, had hitherto been frustrated. But Pope Boniface VIII. was not discouraged. At a large congress of princes at Rome, he instituted the former King of Sicily, James, brother and successor of Alphonso III., as King of Corsica and Sardinia, paying an annual tribute of 3000 silver marks; James became Gonfaloniere of the Roman See; but after the extinction of his legitimate heirs, he engaged in 1297 to subject to the crown of Naples the island of Sicily, which had recognised first Don Pedro, then himself, and then

his brother Frederic, as king. All this was bargained for on the assumption that the Sicilians and their King Frederic of Aragon would submit to the arrangement. This was far from being the case; a fearful struggle ensued, till, by the treaty of Caltabillotta, in 1303, Frederic of Aragon was acknowledged as King of "Trinaeria" for life. He married Eleonora, granddaughter of Charles of Anjou, and promised to take the oath of allegiance to Rome, and to pay quit-rent. The full title of King of Sicily was to remain with the House of Anjou, and the Roman treaty regarding Corsica and Sardinia was to be maintained. And now for the first time the East had discovered the great importance of Sicily. The war had lasted twenty years; four great sea-fights, two great battles by land, and many minor engagements, had been won by the Sicilians; three invading armies had been driven out of the island, Syracuse and Messina had successfully resisted the besieging armies, and two great naval battles had been lost. The tithes of almost all Europe, the treasure of the Popes and of the House of Anjou, the contributions of the Italian Guelfs, and 300,000 ounces of gold, which the Roman See had borrowed, had been spent, and yet the island remained unconquered. The Christian East had been lost, the power of the Palæologi at Constantinople had been confirmed, the Aragonese had gained a footing on the coast of Sicily, the wearisome war between England and France had broken out, and a still greater calamity was impending—the removal of the Papal See from Rome to Avignon.

In the beginning of the thirteenth century Frederic II. had styled himself "German King, by the grace of God and of the Roman See." Towards the end of it King Albert I. acknowledged to Boniface VIII. that both the temporal and spiritual swords belonged to the Pope, who also laid claim to supreme power (*summum imperium*) over Hungary; whilst in the West Edward I. of England and Philip IV. of France refused to accept the mediation of the Pope in their quarrels, except in his private capacity. To the Popes the greatness of the French kings was chiefly due; and in return the House of Anjou reduced Rome, Central Italy, and even the College of Cardinals, to dependence; the Roman chair had already been removed to Aquila and Naples when Boniface VIII. liberated it from the "Neapolitan captivity." When the same Pope tried to break the pride of the French, they suddenly attacked him at Anagni, took him prisoner, and liberated him only a few weeks before his death in Rome. After the short pontificate of Benedict IX., King Philip procured the election of a French Pope, Clement V., who removed the

Papal residence to Avignon. During the whole of the fourteenth century the government of the Church remained in the hands of the French; and when the chair was restored to Rome, the French cardinals commenced the schism of 1378, which for forty years produced such lamentable confusion in the Church.

France had kept herself out of both the imperial and the papal systems of states, and now she came out in mediæval history as a great power, rounded off her frontiers on the south and east, annexed Navarre, Toulouse, the Lyonnaise, &c.; and entangled the Church, which had given her the means for winning all this, in an iron net, whose meshes became ever narrower and more rigid. The same weakness which showed itself in the general affairs of the Church became apparent also in the Mediterranean states. Benedict XI. confirmed the donation of his predecessor to James III. of Aragon. But then James emancipated his son Don Pedro, as Frederic II. had done to his son Henry, perhaps not without an eye to the German crown, which could never, according to the treaty, be united with that of the Aragonese island. Hence the claims on Sardinia could not be vindicated before 1323, when the Infante Alphonso took from Pisa the greater part of the island. But the Genoese would not cede their portion, and in reprisal took Corsica from the Aragonese in 1347, who in return united the Balearic Isles to their crown, which had in 1319 been aggrandised by the union of the Cortes of Aragon, Catalonia, and Valencia. In 1328 Alphonso IV. was forced to swear not to alienate the crown lands on any pretence; and when he did so, his son Don Pedro IV. rose against him, and Alphonso died in the contest, 1336. At his coronation Don Pedro seized the crown from the hands of the Archbishop of Saragossa, and put it on his own head, with the words, "On no account will I be a vassal of the Roman See." This was in 1336; but in 1365 Pope Urban V. compelled him to render homage, at least for Sardinia and Corsica.

Meanwhile Charles II. of Anjou was succeeded on the throne of Naples and Sicily by his third son, Robert, Duke of Catalonia, who was crowned King of Sicily at Avignon, by Pope Clement V., August 26, 1309. At the same time Frederic, King of "Trinacria," was soliciting for the title of King of Jerusalem, James of Aragon for the county of Pisa and the Isle of Elba, Charles of Valois for the Byzantine Empire, and Charles Martel, of the House of Anjou, for Hungary. To counteract this preponderance of the Romanic race, King Henry VII. of Germany, and after him King

Lewis of Bavaria, attempted to set up the German Empire again; but King Frederic of Trinacria took the opportunity of King Henry's Roman expedition to attack King Robert of Sicily; he assumed the title of King of Sicily, and caused his son Don Pedro to be crowned, to whom he secured the succession in spite of all the censures of the Pope; while for his younger son John he obtained the principalities of Athens and Neopatra. But the dispute for the succession continued during the life of Pedro (1343), and of his son Lewis (1355), and up to the time of Frederic III., Lewis's brother, who declared himself and his successors vassals of Queen Joan of Naples (the granddaughter of King Robert), and appealed to Pope Gregory XI. to grant them the kingdom of Trinacria. The Pope, who now maintained his rights to both kingdoms, that of Naples (the continental Sicily), and that of Trinacria (the island), fixed the formula of the oath of allegiance for Frederic, entailed the kingdom of Trinacria, defined the contingencies on which the crown would revert to the Roman See, enacted the liberty of the Church, the perpetual severance of Trinacria from Lombardy, Tuscia, and Germany, and the mode and duration of the dependence of Trinacria upon the crown of Naples. This was in 1372; two years later Frederic took the prescribed oath at the hands of the legate, and was thereupon crowned king in 1375. On his death in 1377, his daughter Mary was protected by Gregory XI. against her cousin, the mighty King Pedro IV. of Aragon. But when this protection failed through the schism, she was forced to marry Prince Martin of Aragon, Don Pedro's grandson; thus Sicily was united to Aragon, and then the Aragonese line of kings became extinct, and the second line (that of Castille, under Ferdinand XI.) obtained the kingdom of Aragon. The second prince of this house, Alphonso V., was adopted by Queen Joan II. of Sicily (Naples), and so obtained the crown of that country. He united Sicily and Sardinia to Aragon; while, with the Pope's consent, he bequeathed Naples to his natural son, Ferdinand I., and his successors, from 1458 to 1551, after which time Naples was united to the Spanish crown by Ferdinand the Catholic, through whom it descended to the House of Hapsburg. Of the old feudal system there was not much more left than the remittance of the white bill. The House of Bourbon, which every where promoted this revolution, discontinued even this expression of homage.

Whilst thus the political system of the Popes continued to exist in the south quite up to the modern period, divested, however, of its old power and privileges, and only surviving

in forms which were abandoned in the eighteenth century, it expired much earlier in the north-west. Yet it is noticeable that the union of Scotland and England attempted by Edward I. met with decided opposition from Pope Nicholas IV., "because Scotland also belonged to the Roman See from old times." King Edward would not mount his father's throne as a vassal of the Roman See, and allowed eight years to elapse before he would pay the Roman tribute; he soon left it off, however, so that in 1316 the arrears amounted to 24,000 marks sterling. Edward's continual wars furnished the pretext for this neglect. The weak Edward II. paid it again, and applied to Pope John XXII. for a second coronation, which he hoped would help him to the Empire of the East. He had been told of a kind of oil which came from the Blessed Virgin, who had given it to the Apostle St. Thomas, which had that special privilege, and with that he wished to be anointed. But with all his weak wishes for the Eastern Empire he lost the crown of England. Urban V., who endeavoured with all his might to reëstablish the political system of the Popes, asked Edward III. to pay the English tribute, which had been dormant since 1333. But the wars with France emancipated England from its former dependence. Moreover, the rival Popes during the schism were reduced to a state of dependence on the princes who embraced their respective parties; yet in the fourteenth century the Papal system seemed still on the increase. Thus Henry, Duke of Halicz, Glogau, and Posna, and heir of Poland, declared himself the immediate subject of the Roman See, and also expressed a hope that if any German emperor tried to exercise any jurisdiction over him, the Pope would defend him against it. In the same year Wladislaus, King of Poland, acknowledged that Ruthenia (*de qua annua tributa consueverunt Papæ percipere*) and Poland were both tributary to Rome. King Robert of Scotland demanded the authority of the Pope for his coronation, in order to secure Scotland against Edward III. Pope John granted it in favour of Robert and his successors, and delegated the performance of the ceremony to the Archbishop of St. Andrew's, or, in default, to the Archbishop of Glasgow. In 1331 the Dukes of Pomerania transferred their principality to the Roman See as a fief, like Sardinia, Corsica, and Sicily. We find vestiges of the extension of the Papal system even to Norway.

In 1340 Africa again invaded Spain; the Moors came over with wives and children, bag and baggage, to establish themselves in the peninsula. This was the fifth and last

invasion of Spain, and was victoriously repulsed in the great battle of Tarifa. Spain might now, if she could keep free from internal dissensions, assume the offensive, and meditate the conquest of Africa. In consequence of this victory a new principality, subject to the Roman See, was formed by Pope Clement VI. in 1344, under the title of the "happy islands, situated in the sea Oceanus, between the south and the west." The Pope gave it to the Castilian prince, Lavis, of the family of Ferdinand de la Cerda, son of King Alphonso X. and of the daughter of Lewis IX., who with his descendants had been excluded from the crown of Castile. The prince accepted the fief at an annual tribute of 400 florins of good and pure gold, and was crowned and took the oath of allegiance November 28, 1344. But the new principality, whose inhabitants—if it had any—were Mussulmans, was to be established by force. But before this could be done Alphonso, King of Portugal, complained that these islands, which belonged to Portugal, and for the conquest of which he had equipped a squadron before the Moorish invasion took place, had been given to a Castilian prince. The Pope in reply called upon the Kings of France, Sicily, Aragon, Castile,—the King of Portugal refused,—the Genoese, and the Dauphin of Vienne, to aid in conquering the new principality. But the five-kings' battle at Cressy, August 26, 1346, where the Kings of France, Navarre, Bohemia, and Majorca were conquered by the King of England, put a stop both to the diversion which the French and Bohemians were to make in Syria against the Ottomans, who were sweeping down upon Europe, and to the erection of the new principality on the coast of West Africa. It remained a mere diplomatic creation. Afterwards a Norman knight, John of Betancour, received these islands from Henry III. of Castile, who now called himself king.

The little that remained of the Papal system was more and more eclipsed in the fifteenth century. In the apostolical kingdom of Hungary, Matthias, King of the Magyars, would not leave to Pope Sixtus IV. even the patronage of prebendal stalls—such a change had come over Europe since the great schism of 1378. "Your holiness may rest assured," he wrote, "that the Hungarian nation will sooner change the double cross, which is the banner of our kingdom, into the triple cross, than allow the prebends and prelacies, which belong to the rights of the crown, to be bestowed by the Apostolic See."

The Hungarian double cross of Rome was not changed for the triple one of Byzantium, but the crescent soon

triumphed there after the Magyar had ceased to regard any thing as higher than the interests of his own kingdom. So England also, when she secluded herself more and more from foreign connection, fell into that ecclesiastical Anglicanism which is foolish enough to call a national establishment in contradiction with itself by the grand name of Universal and Catholic.

Communicated Articles.

NOTES ON THE PRESENT STATE OF AUSTRIA.

It is idle to hope that Austria can remain as she is. There are events in history which are not the acts of man's will, but the products of a natural process, which *grow* but are not *done*; for which, therefore, no particular person is responsible, and to which the ideas of right and wrong, though easily applicable in words, will never be found to apply in fact. In the life of mankind, there are active forces which are not moral; there is a physical necessity which goes its way, regardless of ethical considerations. Nations and families, subjects and rulers, live by physical laws, and are prone to disease, madness, exhaustion, decline, extinction, as well as to progressive increase and improvement. Under the pressure of these physical necessities, it is lost labour to declaim about law; and those who cannot or will not understand, and distinguish when the matter before them is natural, and when moral, only exhibit a weakness and folly such as they are willing to deride in the Legitimists of France. Neither can these natural tendencies be arrested by the expedients of state-craft. Justice is not so easily satisfied. Providence allows the evil to continue till the measure is full, and then exacts the penalty. It only makes the lesson more solemn if the doomed representative of the iniquitous system should be the best of his race, should be really willing to repair the unrighteousness of his forefathers; for when the guilt is not individual, but collective and traditional, poisoning the state from generation to generation, the destruction of a few guilty individuals would be but a poor lesson; the hard necessity of the unchangeable Nemesis is best exhibited for the warning of all tyrants who have any regard for their posterity, when it seizes the innocent victim, and, in its stern reprisals, crushes his bones for the crimes of his fathers.

I fear that these hard sayings may be found applicable to Austria. Its government, though called paternal, was for generations a revolutionary despotism; and the just resistance of Brabant to the laws of Joseph II. was only an example of what would have been equally justifiable in the other provinces. The old system was hatefully oppressive, and the immorality of its officials and their contempt for religion have survived its alteration. Thus, for the 54,000 Protestants who served in the Austrian army there was last year but a single chaplain. Though the suppression of religious orders and the oppression of the Church are things of the past, the results continue. The evil example of the nobility is as scandalous as ever. The Archduke Charles was epileptic; but so was Cæsar. The Emperor Joseph was a well-meaning and active tyrant; Francis I. was a slow, repressive, suspicious despot, fearful of progress, of improvement, of intellect, and of change, cold-hearted and narrow-minded, though not stupid; the ex-Emperor Ferdinand is half an idiot and one or two of his brothers are no better; and Francis Joseph himself has exhibited no superiority. These things lead, by a kind of physiological necessity, to changes, whether in the way of punishment or in the way of remedy, but either of them equally disastrous to existing interests.

Since the outburst of 1848, Francis Joseph has had ten years to try if haply he might be allowed to heal the wounds of the empire. It was, of course, a hazardous experiment. Every great change in the political life of nations has led to a change of dynasty, or the Stuarts and the Bourbons might still be seated on their ancestral thrones. The half-aristocratic rule of the Rurics lasted in Russia until absolutism and servitude were established; and we have yet to see whether the despotism of the Romanoffs can survive the radical changes of Alexander II. But in Austria the danger is still greater. It is not a nation, but an assemblage of nations, brought together by no internal or external necessity, but by the accidental results of imperial marriages and dynastic wars; it is the work of the dynasty, and its existence is scarcely conceivable apart from the family of the Hapsburgs.

Since 1848, the internal perils of Austria are generally to be attributed to unconstitutional parties, who aim, not at the reformation, but at the destruction, of the state, and who therefore become more powerful and more dangerous by every concession. For, as Fiévée says, it is only a strong power that can be conciliatory without endangering itself, or can consider objections without seeming to give up its principles as doubtful. These parties are (1) the Hungarian

Separatists ; (2) the advanced Liberals, consisting chiefly of Jews, who are not more anxious for the advance of their opinions and the advantage of their interests than for a vengeance that shall recompense them for their long disabilities, even at the price of a national collapse ; (3) the Italian party, who desire a united and independent Italy ; (4) the Panslavist party, strong in Bohemia and Galicia, who wish for one great Slavonic empire or confederation. It is clear that the Austrian Government, in order to maintain its own existence, must wage unconditional war with all these separatists, and must consider any understanding with them to be unattainable. This was the idea of Bach, who was the soul of the Austrian policy since 1848. He aimed at the entire unity of the monarchy, and made no concessions either to the various separatist parties, or to the aristocratic Tories who desired the restoration of things to their state before 1848. But the real errors of Bach's policy raised up against him elements of opposition, which, uniting with these separatists, soon brought him to a stand-still.

Bach's plan was to make the empire one in every sense. It was to be administered by the same laws throughout, and all its resources were to be developed to the utmost, and brought as much as possible within the sphere of the state's action. The uniform legislation was to be backed up and strengthened by a system of public instruction, high enough, but uniform for provinces five hundred years apart from each other in civilisation and progress, and by the favour of the Church, which he proposed to purchase by the restoration of her freedom. The development of national resources was to be attained by free trade, abolition of the feudal system and of mercantile restrictions, and by a grand system of railways. The defects of this intelligent plan were, that it was founded neither on the old traditions, nor on the concessions of 1848. It confirmed the abolition of all old privileges, all mediæval reminiscences, while it destroyed the great objects of the revolution, provincial independence and provincial parliaments. The system, therefore, could only enlist a narrow circle of adherents, attracted by the desire of power for the state, of wealth for the nation, and of liberty for the Church. The rest were offended by its sacrifice of the very notion of legitimacy and historical continuance, in not professing either to uphold the new institutions of 1848 or to reform the old. It had no national historical basis ; its instruments, therefore, were not traditions or habits or aspirations, but only a well-organised bureaucracy. Popularity could not be expected till time had developed the benefits of the legislation ; but the building of railways and

the execution of the Concordat was an affair of years. The progress has been enormous in the development of the commercial resources of the country; vast sums have been embarked in speculation; the funded capital of the nation has increased; and the amount raised by taxation has nearly doubled. But these benefits have been obscured by the dishonesty and financial incapacity of the minister Bruck. If he contributed to enrich the nation, he also brought the currency into a state of confusion, from which there seems to be no escape. The charges of corruption which led to his fall are insignificant in comparison to what might have been brought against his former doings. In the affair of the sale of the Austrian railways to a foreign company, he agreed, for a consideration, that all the iron should be furnished by foreign contractors,—an arrangement by which his country lost 5,000,000*l.* The judges who investigated the conduct of suspected persons after the crash traced many a thread to the finance minister, who resisted their claims to examine him, till his dismissal from his post enabled them to require his attendance. His credit had been lost by his raising the national loan for 50,000,000*l.*, which he made more compulsory than voluntary, to 11,000,000*l.* more than the sum authorised. When this was discovered, in the autumn of 1859, after the war, a new loan became necessary, and Bruck went into the market for 20,000,000*l.*, but only got 7,000,000*l.*, so greatly was the public credit shaken. After Bruck became minister, he did not cease his connection with the Trieste houses, with whom he had been in business. When the great Vienna bankers, Arnstein and Eskeles, ruined by the war, asked him for help, he gave them hopes, and delayed their fall for two days, during which he telegraphed to his Trieste friends to secure their deposits; when this was done, he told the Vienna bankers that he could do nothing for them. The impossibility of confidence and security under the rule of such a minister occasioned the failure of the attempts to raise the material condition of Austria.

The same causes have made the Concordat, so far, a failure. It was originally a purely political measure. Felix Swarzenberg, who, in October 1848, a time of great political stress, undertook the formation of a new ministry, and exacted from all his colleagues their agreement to the introduction of the Concordat, was notoriously the most dissolute man among Austrian officers and diplomatists, and lived more like a Turk than a Christian. His religious sentiments certainly had no part in the resolution. It was one of his methods for enforcing unity. But the Concordat was sure to cause

more divisions than it healed if it dissatisfied the masses of Josephine Catholics and Protestants; these would only be satisfied by being allowed the same amount of liberty as was granted to the Church. But this would completely annihilate the benefits expected from the Concordat, one of which was to be the destruction of the independent influence of the Hungarian clergy; for another independent body of Protestant clergy would be set up in place of the Catholics. Thus the original sin of the measure, the insincerity of its first authors, has avenged itself on them. It has been a source of divisions, it has confirmed the Hungarian Protestant opposition, and has hitherto done little good to religion. Not that I question the sincerity of the Emperor; all that has been in his power, the appointment of Bishops, has been most admirably performed; and if this is the only lasting result of the first twelve years of his reign, the Church will have gained not a little by him. But our sympathy with him as the giver of the Concordat must be modified by the patent fact that he was deficient either in intelligence, or in will, or in power, to carry out the system of which it ought to have been only a part. But now, while he recognised the right of the Church to define her own doctrines, the statute which he gave the Protestants made the conservation of *their* doctrines an affair of state. No doubt Protestants in other Catholic countries admit the sovereign to be head of the Church; no doubt also the reservations of Francis Joseph are good for the preservation of what Protestants still retain of sound doctrine. But is it rational that a prince who claims to be arbiter of doctrine should also talk of religious liberty? Is it consistent that, while he lets the Catholics rule themselves by their own institutions, he should impose an external authority on the Protestants? Though this external authority appeared so natural, that most of the Lutherans accepted it, and the German conservative Protestants were in raptures at the check which they hoped it would give to rationalism; though the measure was generous, and greatly to the benefit of the Protestant religion,—it was quite inconsistent with the principle of the Concordat, which is self-government. Farther, when once a deep and prolific principle is admitted, it cannot be confined in an arbitrary manner; when once its claim is allowed in the instance of a religious body, not only other religious bodies will prefer their claims, but it will demand an application to purely secular matters. The principle of self-government implies decentralisation, and the localisation of government; but for this Bach did nothing, whatever were the reasons that prevented him. For ten

years nothing was done ; and when at last a commencement was made, it was useless, because it ought from the first to have run parallel with efforts at concentration ; but the latter principle had won so long odds, that the struggles of the other tendency appeared only irregularities and exceptions. Perhaps, however, it was not in the Emperor's design to carry out the principle of self-government ; and if it was, men's public life is weighed by what they do, not by what they wish to do. I have always hoped that the Concordat was the declaration of a great principle, and not merely an insulated act : as an insulated act, even if it is carried out, it is worthless, because it is only a manifestation of feeling, of religious attachment, or of mere interest, and not of principle ; and therefore stands alone, unsupported, insecure, untrustworthy. We see in France the insecurity of institutions when their liberty depends on arbitrary will. Sometimes Lewis Napoleon performs an act to gain the clergy ; then he does something to gain the republicans. Now he coaxes the Catholics, and now he oppresses them to make friends in another quarter. If religion gains by this, no thanks to him. In the same way, the very reasons which led to the Austrian Concordat, when modified by a change of policy or any other external causes, might naturally and logically upset it. There is no safety unless the Concordat is part of a system, founded on principle, and standing or falling with other liberties. Alone it cannot help to save the state.

Though Francis Joseph restored self-government to the Church, he never seemed to have any conception of the political application of the idea ; he never thoroughly understood the signification of representative institutions, and the incompatibility of any thing else, in the long-run, with a civilised and progressive people. *In the long-run*, I say, because though such institutions are not always necessary, they are the test and token of freedom. The free classes can only hold their own by self-government ; that is, by some kind of participation in the general government. In early times only certain classes were free, and then the kings surrounded themselves with a council of those classes, the nobles, and the clergy. But as history advanced and freedom developed, other classes rose by degrees, first to social freedom, then to political liberty, and so to political power. This produced in various places three, and sometimes four estates, according to the general law which guides the adaptation of the state to society through the social organism itself. Now, however, we often see it happen, that though society is an organism, the state is a mere machine ;

not fitted on to society like a glove, but rather compressing it like a thumbscrew; not growing out of society like its skin, but put upon it from without like a mould, into which society is forced to pour itself. But clearly the state could never grow out of society as its expression and fruit, unless society were organised and distributed into distinct classes and corporations, each enjoying social power in its own sphere; where this distribution is wanting, and the social mass comprehends no moral persons, but only physical units, society is atomic; and the state cannot be an organism, an expression or organ of society, but is supreme and absolute, whatever its forms and constitutional pretences may be. Under these circumstances representative institutions are a delusion and a snare, as they were in France from 1815 to 1848. In this manner the capacity for real representative government is a test of the maturity and health of society. Austria may be expected to have that capacity, for her social state is not in the least atomic; she has every where a great noblesse, and in Hungary a wealthy clergy.

The late ministry, of which Goluchowski was a member, was one of concessions made by fear to strength, not by reason to right. It gradually gave up all the policy of Schwarzenberg and Bach, and restored the critical independence of Hungary in such a way as to give Hungary a vast preponderance in the empire. In the first place, the Hungarians got every thing by clamour; the Germans, who were tolerably silent, obtained much less. Their provinces did not receive a collective representative government, but each territory was to have its separate provincial estates. Thus the Hungarian Diet represented a far greater power than any of the others; it was as if, while Ireland had a collective parliament at Dublin, England were to have a separate parliament for each state of the Heptarchy. Collectively England would be the stronger nation; but each provincial English parliament would be feebler than the Irish. That was the first great error in the constitutions. The next was that—to judge from the constitution of Tyrol, the only one I yet know in detail—the number of representatives in the estates is too small. They will have no independent authority, will inspire no confidence, will be managed by two or three men, and will be open to corruption. This was the very disease that destroyed the old system of estates in Germany. Few people cared to be present, so that the power subsided into the hands of the few, who were easily managed by the ministers; and thus the whole institution lost its vitality. The Tyrolese are any thing but

grateful for what has been given them; the measure does not compensate for the debased state of the currency. Their language is often perfectly ferocious against the government, and they curse their "folly" in 1809 in resisting their union with Bavaria.

But neither is Hungary at all reconciled by the great concessions made to it. In fact, the dissatisfaction and disaffection is rather increased than diminished, because the concessions are only interpreted to be a proof of fear. Concessions made at the last moment, and extorted by threats, never yet got any thanks. There is, so to say, no government party in Hungary. The great nobility, or magnates, lost most of their influence by the abolition of the feudal rights; and yet it was chiefly in favour of this declining body that the new system was contrived. The lesser nobles, who are enormously numerous, and the middle class, are for separation, and for the most part would prefer to belong to Russia. We may read in Görgei's memoirs how the plan was entertained in 1849, and how the Russians tried to make friends in the country by treating all who surrendered to them with signal courtesy. In spite of Nicholas's conservatism, they would never have put down the insurrection of 1849, except on account of their fears for Poland, excited by Kossuth, who surrounded himself with Bem, Dembinski, and other Polish refugees, and tried to extend the revolutionary movement into that country. But now the action of the Hungarian emigrants, Kossuth, Klapka, and company, counts for next to nothing in Hungary, and Russia is not likely to be drawn in to assist Austria again, except compelled to do so in self-defence. The opposition comes from the middle class and lower noblesse, men full of distrust of Austria and of crude political notions, burning with just hatred for the equally crude ideas and for the hard proceedings of German *employés*; and proud of their old constitution, which is as bad as it is old,—a mediæval ruin transplanted into a modern city-square. In 1848-9, Hungary was in arms for the Magyar interest; but the Croatian, Slavonic, and Roumanic populations were on the Austrian side. But now they are all as discontented as the Magyars. The centralising system, which was formerly exercised for the advantage of the Hungarian government, has of late been in the hands of the Austrians, and the sufferers have transferred their hatred to their new oppressors. On a late occasion, when there was a famine in Croatia, the Hungarians with wise generosity sent large supplies, and gained the people's hearts. And now the great movements which are taking place in the Danubian

provinces are against Turkey and Austria, and afford to the Hungarians an opportunity of forming a powerful eastern monarchy, if they separate from Austria. This may be the providential purpose of the grievous troubles of Austria on that side. The late ecclesiastical movement of the Bulgarians shows the importance of a strong power not hostile to Catholics having the command of the Lower Danube.

Another capital fault of Goluchowski's measures was, that they provided a new system without looking for new men to carry it out. The statute overthrew the intelligent but pedantic bureaucrats of Bach, who had succeeded the stupid bureaucrats of Metternich's time, and who were omnipotent and very unpopular. Yet they were to carry out the new system. Their cause was conquered, and yet by their instrumentality their employer expected to construct his new system. Those men whose moral influence in the temporary Reichsrath carried these concessions in spite of the resistance of ministers, though placed in offices of more or less importance, were not intrusted with the carrying out of the new system, which was left in the hands of the old opponents of all change. As might be expected from such unintelligent persons, they doled out their measures only as they were forced; while Hungary contemptuously carried off almost every thing, the Germans squeezed out mere dribblets, unwillingly conceded, and not a whole system,—a great statesmanlike measure to be carried out consistently. It was not a policy, nor the idea of a statesman, but only the surrender of as little as might be of popular demands to popular clamour. All that self-government gained, bureaucracy was to lose; but it by no means intended to lose any thing at all in substance.

The substitution of Schmerling for Goluchowski was a partial remedy for this capital fault. The new minister, who has played no public part for the last ten years, was Minister of the Interior in the National Assembly at Frankfort, and was the first parliamentary and administrative genius there. He predominated so completely in that great parliamentary assembly, that he is certainly able to understand, appreciate, and manage representative institutions. He is the right man for a new policy.

The external dangers of Austria lie partly on the side of Italy, partly on that of Prussia. As for Venetia, unless the war in the spring ends in a great victory, that province will be the source of infinite danger to the monarchy. Provision is being made for a desperate struggle: the fortifications that are being erected on the Adige and the Adriatic are

described as terrible, and the whole force of the empire will be poured into Italy and Croatia. The Confederation has waived its claim to the services of the Austrian contingent, amounting to 130,000 men, in case of war on the Rhine; this is the whole aid that is to be expected from Prussia; but though it is a great assistance to Austria, it argues not much generosity on the part of her rival. For if there is war on the Rhine, while Napoleon has 200,000 men in Italy, his fleet fully manned, and his fortresses on the Rhine and the Flemish frontier garrisoned, the Germans can make a very good fight without Austrian assistance, and Prussia will have the undisputed lead of the army of the Confederation. As Russia is opposed to the proceedings in Italy, it will not threaten the rear of the Austrians, and may even protect them against revolutionary movements; and the whole military force of the empire can be concentrated on the Drave and the Adige. Already the army in Italy and about the head of the Adriatic amounts to nearly 300,000 men; there is no disaffection in the Hungarian regiments, and the popularity of Benedek is immense. But the military system of Austria is wretched. The science of the officers is not to be compared to that of the Piedmontese; there is no good staff, nor any well-organised body of engineers; many of the officers are incapable, and others unable to speak the language of their soldiers. And there is among some of them a feeling that they are about to fight for what they are persuaded is a hopeless cause. If this was a common persuasion, no anticipations could be too gloomy for the future of Austria.

Whilst in Austria every thing smacks of decline and fall, the Prussians are full of lofty aspirations. The government is secure, and, in spite of the late police scandals, on the whole well administered and popular. There is some injustice, but no known corruption. The danger which menaces Germany on the Rhine, and the dismal condition of Austria, both play into the hands of Prussia; for the Germans, indignant at their helplessness, can only look to her to save them. A like result follows from the corruptions of several of the lesser states, and the consequent discontent of their subjects; from the democratic tendencies which remain from 1848, and from the Prussian intrigues. Any day a movement may break out in Central Germany, encouraged by the party of Gotha, justified in many minds by the imminence of the French danger, pioneered by the example of Italy, and half invited by the tardiness of the Prussian ministry to condemn what is going on there. German unity, moreover, is an older ideal than the unity of Italy; only the former is

historical. Italy from the sea to the Alps never at any time formed one state, and its possibility is all speculation and aspiration. But Germany was once one from the Somme to the Drave, and from Lyons to Königsberg, and the reminiscences are preserved in many traditional institutions and phrases. Every German knows that the misfortunes of his country, and its weakness in Europe, arose from the dismemberment of the Empire, the feebleness of the central power, and the rise of the great nobles to territorial independence. The unity of Germany is an aspiration that has once been realised; that is the aim of all patriots, and that has never been quite lost sight of as a hope or a regret. It was through the tendency to unity that in 1806 and in 1815 such numbers of independent sovereigns were swept away; that from more than 365 they have been reduced to 34. The notion of continuing in the same course is not a purely revolutionary idea, but an historical development of the reaction against the process of separation which went on during the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries.

In case of a movement in favour of this idea taking place, Prussia, with its finances flourishing and its army in the best order, and supported by the patriotism of all Germany, is ready to intervene as the restorer of order, and to assume, quite naturally, the command over all the German troops. It will every where find many friends: almost all the Protestants, all the advanced liberals who are not yet democrats,—to make sure of whom Prussia is meditating a reaction against Catholics, and a withdrawal of some of the concessions, in imitation of the measures which the Prussian government has persuaded the Baden ministry to adopt, and in deference to the no-Popery agitation which has been lately commenced by the leading Protestant reviews against Catholic immunities as exaggerated and dangerous. All the left bank of the Rhine, in fear of becoming French, and unable to help itself, looks to Prussia. Even in Bavaria, the largest, most Catholic, and most Austrian of the lesser states, there is a powerful Prussian party, not only in Nuremberg and the Protestant towns, but at court, among the friends of the king, who has always been opposed to Austrian influence, partly because he studied at Berlin and has a Prussian wife, partly because he dislikes the clerical system as he supposes it to exist in Austria, and partly because he is so overshadowed by his great neighbour. It is in the more distant states, which are in no danger of annexation, that Austria is most popular; as with the old King of Wirtemberg, the Duke of Nassau, and the Grand-Duke of Darmstadt, whose brother

is one of the most popular commanders in the Austrian service. Among the Prussian influences we must not forget the newspapers in that interest that are largely paid by that government throughout Southern Germany, and the intrigues at the courts against the princes, for which incredible means are adopted, money being given to women to swear away the characters of Francis Joseph and of the King of Saxony. In Hesse Cassel, the worst governed state of Germany, a perpetual constitutional controversy is maintained: the Radical Constitution of 1831, being found incompatible with order, was abrogated in 1848, and another issued; and there is an endless agitation in favour of the restoration of the former, which is fed by Prussia, in hopes of finding an occasion of intervention. In Baden, the rejection of the Concordat was a Prussian manoeuvre aimed against the throne of the Grand-Duke; and this breach of faith has quite alienated the Catholic population from him.

The Liberals now in power at Berlin are thus indifferent to all law, civil or international. The bulk of the literary men in Prussia, and in great part of Germany, as well as most of the Protestant interest, belongs to them. Their head is the Princess of Prussia, the Regent's wife, one of the most able and ambitious of living women. She prompted the king to accept the imperial crown when it was offered to him in 1848. She has made great efforts to conciliate the Catholics of Western Prussia, where she used to frequent the convents, and sometimes to shut herself up in one for a week, and, as was to be expected, found the Catholics good-natured enough to be duped by her demonstrations. Auerswald is her instrument in the ministry; and her policy, which carries away Schleinitz and Bethmann-Holweg, is the union of Germany under the Prussian sceptre. The policy of Radowitz, the great Catholic statesman from 1848 to 1850, was not very different. As for the Regent, he is a man of honour and good feeling, and desirous to act even chivalrously by Austria; but he is carried away by the party in power.

The Prussian Catholics, who are mostly Silesians and Rhinelanders, and so only Prussians since 1745 and 1815, do not desire the increase of Prussia, as they dread the Berlin system and its prevalence in Germany. But the most remarkable of its opponents are the strict Protestant party of the *Kreuzzeitung*, that was in power under the late king, but is now powerless;—aristocratic and conservative, like Burke, but more advanced than he;—when in power, not always just, especially to Catholics, and making use of corruption somewhat after the manner of Guizot;—high Protes-

tants, like the advanced Tractarians, singularly fond of the mediæval Church, with its monks, partly because of its analogy to their form of Christianity, partly because they consider Catholicism to be a great and beneficent social power;—haters of the Revolution, but not always so strongly opposed to revolutionary measures from above as to those from below, and therefore inclining to Russia rather than to France, which they abhor;—full of admiration for an ideal England, and of contempt for the present government;—Prussians of the old stock, and therefore preferring a powerful Prussia within its own limits to a Prussified Germany, in which their nationality would be destroyed, and liberalism would be triumphant. Hence these men are the most ardent defenders of the Pope's rights, of the King of Naples, and of the Austrians in Italy. This feeling is so strong among them, that their ablest representative, Leo, a month or two ago, had some meetings with certain Catholics at Erfurt to discuss the combinations that seemed possible; but when the report got about that he and his friends were about to become Catholics, they withdrew. This party, however, is much too weak to be of any real service to Austria.

Such is the present seething condition of a people numbering more than 60,000,000, of rare gifts, both of intellect and character, and destined apparently to play a remarkable part in the future history of Europe. Among the many openings for speculation is the effect of the Pope's possible, if not probable, sojourn at Wurtzburg, on the frontier-land of the Protestants and Catholics, and in the presence of an influential body of religionists like those of which Leo is the representative. The action which such an event might have on the population of Germany, and its reaction on the Italianism of the Papal Court, would probably be immense; but it is too large a subject for me to pretend to discuss at the end of an Article.

A.

PREACHING AND PUBLIC SPEAKING.

A BOLD correspondent of this Magazine lately ventured upon a contrast between Catholic and Protestant preaching, to the disadvantage of the Catholic side. Comparisons are proverbially unpopular, and that of the writer in question proved no exception to the rule. It was said, not only that his conclusion was wrong, but that he had no right to publish it. With the former part of this comment I am disposed to agree,

but to the latter part of it I presume to demur. It seems to me undesirable, even if it were possible, to put an extinguisher upon such questions. Facts are, after all, what they are; and truth is pretty sure to find its level in the long-run. Preaching is regarded, in this country at least, as a subject which is eminently *publici juris*; and by claiming the right of praising sermons we concede that of finding fault with them. Abstinence from all criticism on such matters is a perfectly intelligible and highly Christian line. But we are apt to forget that even praise itself is criticism; and that if once we begin to criticise, we cannot expect to rule things all our own way.

But now, as to the writer's conclusion, I think it hardly warranted by facts; besides that his comparison is, as it strikes me, in more than one respect unfair. Our priests bear so small a proportion to the number of the Protestant clergy, even those of the Establishment, that the two sides of the comparison are but ill-matched in the materials for an induction. Considered, again, in the light of literary productions, the sermons of the Protestant clergy derive an undue advantage in the comparison from the vast encouragements offered to literature by the endowments of the Protestant Church. Moreover, it is palpably unfair to compare sermons which are preached from book with those which, as a general rule, are delivered without book, and in language framed on the spur of the moment. Upon the relative advantages of these several methods of preaching I shall speak hereafter. Here it suffices to observe that, whatever the advantage of the more *extempore* practice, sermons preached according to that rule may be expected to suffer in style and finish, in the comparison with carefully-prepared written compositions.

Again, is there not a danger of our comparative estimate of the two sides of this question being affected in some degree by the prejudice denoted in the adage, *Virtutem incolumem odimus*, &c.? While Catholics decry Catholic preaching, Protestants flock to hear Catholic preachers; and while we extol the results of their pulpit, they themselves have little enough that is good to say of it. If one half of the stories which are current among them be well-founded, their clergy are often reduced to shifts which prove, not merely the poverty of their intellectual resources, and the scantiness of their theological knowledge, but likewise, in a signal degree, their exceedingly low estimation of the dignity of the word of God. It is generally believed that in most large towns there are places where sermons are furnished to

needy clergymen in any style of theology. Certain it is that the manuscript discourses of deceased divines are always eagerly caught up; nor should we so frequently see in the public papers, especially those which have a large clerical circulation, advertisements of "Sermons for every Sunday in the year," were not purchasers readily found for them. I have myself heard of cases where clergymen have been treated from the pulpit to a bad reading of one of their own published discourses. Now these are expedients which I venture to say are unknown among Catholics. A hard-worked priest may indeed at times have been driven upon using a sermon of Bourdaloue, or other standard divine, rather than come before his people with a crude performance of his own. But as to vendible oratory and sermon depôts, I never heard of such things on this side the border.

If, then, the comparison halt in its members, we are dispensed from the necessity of testing its results. Yet while few candid Catholics will be found to deny that our preaching is capable of improvement, no fair-minded Protestant, sufficiently cognisant of facts, will be apt to dispute that the English Catholic Church, "little flock" though it be, may boast of possessing some of the first preachers in this country. It is true that not a few of these are converts; but these converts are indebted for their success in the pulpit to their Catholic experience, quite as much as to their pre-Catholic antecedents. Moreover, the practice of preaching without book, which they have acquired since their conversion, is almost like a new start in their work. Yet such is the facility which more than one of them has gained in this method, that their discourses, if transferred from their lips to paper, would read like finished compositions. Then, again, as to the more average specimens of the same class, which must be pitted, of course, against the corresponding portion of Protestant preachers,—whatever defects may be attributed to our average sermons, viewed simply as literary productions, there is generally enough of the *πίστις ἠθικὴ*—the power of moral persuasiveness—about them to outweigh the absence of more artistic qualities. I have heard it said by priests who have once been Protestant ministers, that even inferior Catholic sermons have greatly the advantage of first-rate Protestant discourses in their effect upon the consciences of hearers. This, no doubt, is in part owing to the influence of the confessional, which gets Catholics into a way of treating sermons as real opportunities of good, and believing that a preacher means what he says. But it proves also that the preachers themselves have a just sense of the responsibility

of their office, and make up in sincerity of purpose and earnestness of manner what they may want of those natural gifts or adventitious embellishments which moral requisites can so abundantly compensate, but which, without those requisites, are but as "sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal."

And this brings me at once to the main portion of my task, which is to labour after a clear idea of the true object of preaching, and to offer some respectful considerations upon the means by which that object may be most successfully attained.

If any one were to raise the question, whether the preacher can possibly recognise as paramount any other ends of preaching than the glory of God, and the salvation of his hearers, serious people would pronounce that the very doubt conveyed an affront to the pious instincts of every Christian. Despite, however, these holy protests and indignant disclaimers, I am by no means sure that, practically, one Protestant preacher in twenty acts simply upon this view of his office. I am far from saying that they would ignore it, still less repudiate it; all I mean is, that they do not (as the phrase is) "realise" their true aim by habitually acting upon it. Of course *all* preachers are in great danger of losing sight of the true end of preaching, unless, in Catholic language, they often "renew the intention." Countless motives come in to obscure it. There is a Bishop to be pleased; there are adverse critics to be propitiated; there are extremes to be avoided; there is a church to fill, or a meeting-house to empty; and there are other considerations less creditable by far, and more intimately connected with "dear number one," which are apt to complicate motives and put conscience to sleep. Again, it may be safely and freely admitted that sermons vary materially in character, and that the great end of converting or sanctifying hearers belongs more peculiarly to some kinds than to others. It must always be the implied and ultimate end; it need not always be that which is the more direct and prominent. There are, for instance, funeral sermons, in which the commemoration of the deceased is a most allowable, and may even be a leading, object of the preacher; there are sermons on the merits of a particular saint, which are even known by the name of "panegyrics;" there are running commentaries on an epistle or gospel, where instruction rather than exhortation is the object; there are "charity sermons," the immediate purpose of which is to "raise the wind;" there are other sermons "on particular occasions," where the "occasion" is lawfully the chief topic; and all these are

characteristically different from the hortatory sermon, the undivided object of which is, or ought to be, to bring some great practical truth home to the consciences of the hearers. But none of these exceptions (and they might easily be multiplied) make allowance for the operation of any personal or unworthy motive, nor even of motives which are otherwise than strictly collateral and subsidiary to the main object.

To regard a sermon mainly or chiefly in the light of a literary exercise, seems to involve some unconscious ignoring of an acknowledged principle. A sermon which has the merit of a finished composition, which abounds in elegant language, well-balanced periods, felicitous illustrations,—which is delivered, moreover, with a clear intonation and in a faultless manner,—has no claim, so far, to be considered a “good sermon” at all. A good essay it may be, or a good speech; but the word “sermon” is out of place in what, for any thing which appears, may want the essential qualities of a Christian address.

But why, it will be said, may not such artistic excellencies be allowable as accessories? Even then I am somewhat inclined to be suspicious of them. Do classic taste and rhetorical finish always add to the persuasiveness of a sermon? I am much inclined to doubt it. There is great danger of “the man” eclipsing his subject. Then, too, it is so much easier to admire a sermon than to apply it, *i. e.* except to our neighbour. The devil is a first-rate preacher in his way; he has also his partisans in every congregation, and can hold communication with them over the preacher’s head. I am far from wishing to claim any exemption from the faults of human nature; but I have no hesitation in declaring that the most inornate of sermons which seems to come from the heart, interests and affects me so much more powerfully than a piece of mere rhetoric or a finished essay, that the effects of the two are simply incommensurable.

Not, of course, that I would propose a merely earnest sermon as the model of perfect preaching. On the contrary, I am about to offer a few practical suggestions as to the mode in which earnestness may be made to tell to the best advantage. But as I am writing exclusively for Catholics, and as all my intended observations will be made on the assumption that sermons (as is almost invariably the case with us) are more of the nature of speeches than of essays, I must, in the first instance, say a few words in defence of this Catholic practice itself.

Read sermons have no doubt some obvious advantage over mere spoken ones. They secure a preacher infallibly

against a break-down. There are cases in which he would give his ears for a manuscript; and others in which his audience would give—not, indeed, that particular organ, but a reasonable consideration, for the same advantage.

Again, a manuscript is a protection against bungling as well as against absolute collapse. A man has advantages in writing a sentence in his library which may fail him in a public position. The weight, however, of this argument will depend very much upon the importance attached to the mere *composition* of a sermon, upon which perhaps my own opinion may be exceptional.

A still more unquestionable advantage on the side of writing sermons is that of the care which deliberate composition implies. Here, indeed, one may say unhesitatingly, that if preaching “without book” is to be literally, or even chiefly “*extempore*,”—that is, if it do not involve an amount of mental preparation scarcely inferior to the intellectual effort which it would require to *write* a sermon entire,—one would wish to see it altogether superseded by a method which any how requires a painstaking solicitude about a duty the momentous nature of which needs no comment.

Yet, after all, and under this limitation, I greatly prefer the Catholic practice of delivering, instead of reading, pulpit addresses. Could those addresses, indeed, if read from a manuscript, be so delivered as to appear to be spoken, such a course would no doubt meet a part of the objection. Indeed, my feeling does not go against *writing* sermons, but against *reading* them. I am inclined, on the contrary, to think that one of the best courses for a man who has to make a pulpit address, about the terms of which he is very particular, is first to write it entirely out, and then, leaving his manuscript in his portfolio, to preach it, not *verbatim*, but from his general recollection of his copy. It will thus be apt to combine the united advantage of composition and spontaneous oratory. The speaker keeps before his mind a clear view of the subject and its arrangement, while he remembers enough of the actual words to aid him in putting it into shape, but not so much as to give his address the appearance of being a mere transcript. On the other hand, of all courses which a speaker can adopt, the very worst is that of bringing a manuscript copy into public without meaning to use it. In that case, he is sure to be always hankering after his pocket, and should he happen to get into a boggle, instead of extricating himself from it by his own unaided exertions, he loses his presence of mind, flies to his copy, probably misses the place (which has an ugly knack of hiding itself when it

is wanted), and thus draws the whole attention of his audience to his embarrassment, which otherwise, perhaps, might never have been observed. No; there is no medium between our own legs and a good pair of crutches; and if positively sure that we cannot get on alone, we had better make up our minds to secure an assistance which is proof against a slip.

Where an inexperienced preacher has not time to write out his sermon, the best thing he can do is to make copious notes; still leaving the actual words to find themselves for the occasion. There is not the same objection to taking a paper of notes with us into public as exists against taking a literal transcript of our address without intending to use it. For notes are mere hints, which would not help us through the difficulties of a panic, even if we had recourse to them, and so are never thought of in that point of view. Still, if our speaker can dispense even with notes, so much the better for the effect of his address.

The great advantage of speaking over reading is, that it is the more natural mode of enforcing a cause which we have at heart. It also creates on the part of the audience an imagination of the speaker's ability, which is no mean help to the effect of his exhortations.

A speaker may dispense with his manuscript, and dispense even with his notes; but two requisites there are which he can never afford to go without, and these are: (1) a copious supply of matter, and (2) an orderly arrangement of it, thoroughly mastered by means of previous reflection. If his matter be not pre-arranged, it will be apt to crowd upon him with overwhelming pressure. But if (worse still) it do not exist, the result must inevitably be either a collapse or one of those aimless and meaningless discourses, comprising a string of pious platitudes, which wash like innocuous waves over the heads of the self-satisfied auditory.

With plenty of matter, previous reflection, deep interest in his subject, an ordinary command of language, and, above all, a cool head, a speaker will soon triumph over all obstacles, except of course those mere accidents which no prudence can forecast, and against the chances of which no work in the world is secure.

Self-possession is not only indispensable to oratorical success, but it is alone more than half the battle. Self-possession is often a main part of eloquence. Failures in public appearances are in some cases very commonly the result of merely physical causes, yet we are by no means disposed to refer "nervousness" to physical causes alone. It is as often a moral as a constitutional malady. It is intimately con-

nected with our egotistical propensities. It bears to vain-glory the same relation which shyness bears to pride. Hence we have the satisfaction of knowing that it admits in most cases of a cure, or at least a material mitigation. What spiritual writers call "indifference" is a far better remedy for nervousness than sal-volatile. Men are by their natural temperament and habits of life more "indifferent" than women, that is, they care less what happens to them. Hence they are proportionately less nervous. That which in ordinary men is a mere characteristic of the sex is with religious men the effect of principle, and the fruit of meditation. Hence the religious are seldom nervous; and this is one reason why they shine in public ministrations. A man who disciplines himself for martyrdom, and who courts rather than shirks contumely and disesteem, is not likely to be over-sensitive to the disgrace of breaking down in a sermon; and the absence of all apprehension of failure is a main part of the secret of success. With self-possession and a good fund of materials, an educated orator is very independent of circumstances.

Yet nervousness is not wholly a moral malady, and deserves immense compassion. The freaks of a nervous temperament are among the most curious phenomena of our physical constitution. A nervous temperament is the very field of delusions, the most absurd, yet the most obstinate. Preachers, more than one, who, were I to mention their names, would be pronounced models of self-possession in the pulpit, have told me that they hardly ever come before the public without an almost crushing apprehension of failure, which regularly vanishes when they begin, and as regularly recurs next time. Another singular fact is, that this nervous dread is often cured by the very circumstances the anticipation of which excites it. It haunts a preacher in the sacristy, and passes off the instant he faces his audience. Again, there is many a man who can command his mind far better in the presence of five thousand spectators and listeners, than before even one person with whom he is not at his ease. Indeed, my own experience would lead me to the opinion that nervous embarrassment is often inversely as the apparent occasion for it. Why is it that many find it easier to address a large multitude than a few stragglers? First, the scene inspirits us. Then, no doubt, there is a support in feeling that a great deal is at stake. But besides all this, fancied obstacles do not, in fact, increase in the ratio of numbers. In a small audience every one seems to be a listener; while, in a large one, criticism seems to be

diluted by diffusion. Happy, above all, is that preacher whom a yawn does not flutter, and who remains master of himself during a slow cannonade of snores! He is not far from excellence both as an orator and as a Christian.

It has been often remarked, and with a certain amount of truth, that good writing and good speaking seldom go together. Lord Derby, the greatest orator of the day, is said not to excel as a letter-writer. The late Dr. Howley, who was a remarkably classical English writer, could not put two sentences together in a public speech. The reason is obvious. The habit of selecting the most appropriate words which written composition induces, is highly unfavourable to oratorical fluency, which is destroyed by "harking back" after a more suitable expression. But this observation applies only to a highly-polished and fastidiously-accurate style of writing, or, on the other hand, of oratory. The habit of easy and natural composition, so far from prejudicing the power of oral expression, assists it, and *vice versâ*. It is when over-precise writers try to be fluent orators, or declamatory orators try to be fastidious writers, that they find the powers of nature unequal to so trying an exaction. William Wilberforce was a good writer as well as a brilliant orator; but this was because he wrote, to all appearance, *currente calamo*.

The two marplots of eloquence are correction and hesitation. Flow is next in importance to matter. The attempt at over-nicety of phrase involves a constant change of words, and checks the current of attention. Hearers always think more of fluency than of accuracy. Hence a less perfect word without a pause is generally preferable to a more perfect one which has to be got at by circuitous means. Any thing is better than an awkward and unexpected break. Nature does not abhor a vacuum more than oratory. Should such a void loom in the distance, it must be filled up by words of some sort, and not slurred over by "humming and hawing." We easily overrate the sensitiveness of the audience to defects, but its sensitiveness to bungling we cannot exaggerate.

There are well-known proverbs which attest that the most critical portions of every work are the beginning and the end. This is peculiarly true of public speaking. The beginning of an address should always be simple and unpresuming, and the end such as not, at any rate, to weaken, but rather to confirm and fix, the impression of the whole. This, however, is not always easy. A speaker who is not very self-possessed is apt to exhaust himself and his matter at the outset. To husband his resources is one of the first rules for an orator. For my own part, I prefer sermons which begin

with a very simple explanation of the text, and so launch us gently into the depths of the subject. The *fumum ex fulgore* is above all things to be avoided. I have observed that Catholic preachers do not commonly follow the Protestant practice of pre-announcing the heads of their discourse, and I think they are wise. In the first place, this practice always sounds over-methodical; and besides, it distracts the hearer to know what he is to expect before he is quit of what is before him.

But if the opening of a speech be difficult as well as important, the ending is certainly not less so. All but very experienced speakers are apt to fail here. Some never know when to end, and others never know how. Many speakers, when drawing to a close, contrive to wind themselves in their own silk into the condition of a cocoon. They spin and spin, till the point of their sermon is well-nigh dissipated; and they work themselves into their bed so deeply that they do not find it easy to get out. They signal the prospect of an exit by a "one word more," which is often the beginning of sermon No. 2. Then the clock strikes one, if not two, or the congregation makes a sudden descent upon its knees, or something else happens to remind the preacher that he is forgetting himself. End he must, by some means, and, in his strait, he makes a sort of convulsive grasp at the first termination which occurs to him. He has no resource but to seize upon some hackneyed formula of dismissal; and brings up what perhaps has been really a good and effective discourse, as the school-boy finishes off his Sunday exercise, with some such indefinite promise as "happiness in this present world, and in the world to come life everlasting." Hence it seems a good practice for unpractised speakers to commit to memory the very words with which they intend to wind up their addresses.

Speakers, especially such as are inexperienced, should avoid long paragraphs. Otherwise, they will be in danger of involved and inconsecutive talking. They should also eschew tropes. One of the hardest things in oratory is to sustain a metaphor. The example of the celebrated Lord Castlereagh is a warning to all orators who venture upon imagery without being sure of their ground.

The great secret of a preacher's success is to mean what he says, and say no more than he means. It is wonderful how easy it is in the pulpit to be unnatural without the slightest real insincerity. Off-hand preaching undoubtedly favours this tendency. It easily glides into ranting. Without imperturbable coolness and self-command, a preacher is

sure to fall into a tone of exaggeration or sentimentality. "His poverty and not his will consents" to saying from the preacher's chair far more than he is prepared to endorse in private. I well remember the sinking of heart which it gave me to read that a foreign priest, who was the subject of a too-celebrated law-case some years ago, had the character in his day of being a first-rate preacher on the Passion of our Lord.

The extreme danger and evil of "unreality" in the pulpit leads some preachers into an opposite extreme, and makes them over-familiar. They err in matter, as Dr. Whately is said to have erred in manner, when, on the plea of being "natural," he advocated uncouthness. There is indeed a kind of familiarity in the pulpit, especially in retreat-sermons, which is graceful and delightful. Many Italian missionaries have it. Father Faber, too, has it in a remarkable degree, especially in his published "Conferences." There is a charm of nature, a refinement of wit, a felicity of illustration, about those discourses which is quite refreshing. But, *non cuivis homini*, &c. Familiarity and humour, though they have a place in preaching, are edge-tools in the hands of the unskilful. "Be thou familiar, but by no means vulgar," is a maxim as useful for the preacher as for the gentleman. Yet surely there must be some golden mean between stiffness and over-freedom, and which cannot be hard of attainment to preachers who are habitually careful to carry up their common sense into the pulpit, instead of leaving it with their coats in the vestry.

I close with a few words of explanation, which, on a review of this Article, seem to be demanded by its tenor and perhaps even more by its tone. It is difficult to be smart without seeming satirical, and to draw pictures which shall not be suspected of having their originals. Could I bare my heart, however, this natural suspicion would be found utterly without counterpart in fact. It would be seen that I had been making confession rather than indulging in criticism; revealing the conclusions of personal experience, rather than proclaiming the results of observation.

Again, it cannot, as I hope, be fairly said that I have set the requirements of the preacher higher than reason warrants, or facts bear out. To recapitulate those requirements, in the order in which I have stated them, will be enough to show that they are easily attainable, as well as commonly attained. First, earnestness; secondly, matter; thirdly, method; fourthly, self-possession; and fifthly, the observance of a few simple rules, which it is really easier to

follow than to neglect. Other than these, I know of no qualifications for preaching but those which every priest may be expected to bring to the work. Such are, competent theological knowledge, the *zelus animarum*, and habitual meditation on Divine Truth. But these are matters which lie beside the scope of this Article, and beyond the province of a popular Magazine. They relate to preaching *proper*, whereas my business has been with it rather as it is a branch of public speaking.

F.

EDMUND CAMPION.—No. I.

EDMUND CAMPION, the protomartyr of the English Jesuits, was born in London on St. Paul's day, January 25, 15³⁹/₄₀, the thirtieth year of Henry VIII., a year marked by the suppression of the great religious houses in England, and the inauguration of a persecution of which, forty years after, Campion was to be a victim, as well as by the Pope's solemn approval of the Society of Jesus, of which he was to be an ornament. His father was also Edmund Campion, citizen and bookseller of London. "His parents were not wealthy in the riches of this world, but very honest and Catholic," says Father Parsons. Campion himself was not so certain of this; he only "hopes" that they died in the faith. They had four children, a girl and three boys, of whom Edmund was either eldest or second. He and his youngest brother took to books; the other preferred adventure, and took a wife, who was occasionally left to herself while her husband served in the wars.

When Edmund was come to "years of discretion," that is, when he was nine or ten, his parents wished to apprentice him to some merchant; but some members of one of the London companies—Parsons thinks that of the merchant adventurers, but I think the grocers—having become acquainted with the "sharp and pregnant wit" that he had shown from his childhood, induced their guild to undertake to maintain him "at their common charges to the study of learning." He was sent first to some London grammar-school, and afterwards to the new foundation of Edward VI. at Christ Church, Newgate Street,—if we may call it his foundation; but a new religion had brought in new notions of merit and reparation; it was ample satisfaction for the theft of a hog to bestow its feet in alms. Just three weeks before he died, Henry VIII. not only atoned for his wholesale pillage of the

church, but acquired the honours of a founder and benefactor, by restoring St. Bartholomew's, Smithfield, to the service of God and the poor; and his son followed his example by founding schools with some of the confiscated Church property, according to the lesson first taught by Cardinal Wolsey, and since repeated with variations by most of the European governments. Christ-Church Hospital, or the Blue-Coat School, was one of these foundations.

In those days there seems to have been a common *concursus* among the London grammar-schools, as if they had formed a university. Campion is said "ever to have borne away the game in all contentions of learning proposed by the schools of London;" a fact which he would occasionally "merrily mention" in after life, not without some talk of the prizes he had gained. His "championship" was acknowledged; and so when Queen Mary, on her solemn entry into London, August 3, 1553, had to pass by St. Paul's School, it was none of the "Paul's pidgeons" that was selected to address her, but Campion, as the representative of London scholarship, was brought from Newgate Street to make the requisite harangue. Minds that had faith in functions would have triumphed in the prospects which that day opened to the Church. They could not admit that the enthusiasm could be so soon cooled. They noted with admiration the long procession: the lords marching three and three together; the ambassadors surrounded with crowds of their own countrymen, and each attended by one of the privy councillors—the Spanish Ambassador for greater honour attended by St. John the Lord Treasurer; the Lord Mayor, Sir Thomas White, who was afterwards to be Campion's great patron; the Earl of Arundel, bearing the sword before the queen; the queen herself, "in a long-sleeved robe of crimson velvet, with side-sleeves and train of the same, enriched with gold embroidery and precious stones;" followed by her sister, the Lady Elizabeth, and a hundred and sixty other ladies,—duchesses, countesses, dames, mistresses, and maids. Eight thousand horsemen rode in the procession, and the Tower guns kept firing from the first moment the queen passed under Temple Bar till she reached the old fortress; the roofs and streets were crowded with citizens singing, playing organs, and shouting, "God save Queen Mary!" It was in the midst of this tumult that little Campion had to spout his address, and to share the honours of a day when good-humour ruled, and criticism was mute except to applaud. The queen is said to have been much pleased with him, and the people cheered him heartily, though they probably did not hear a

word he said ; for at thirteen he had not that "sweet, modulated, full, sonorous bass voice" which afterwards inspired hearts with so high resolves, though there might have been the *faciei grata venustus*, a youthful beauty against whose rhetoric the people could not hold argument, and anticipations of excellence to make citizens proud of their young champion.

When Sir Thomas White founded St. John's College, Oxford, the Grocers' Company dealt with him to admit this youth as a scholar, "which he did most willingly after he was informed of his towardliness and virtue." The Company gave him an exhibition for his maintenance. In 1557, when the college was increased, Campion became junior fellow; for the founder had conceived a special affection for him, and he had in very short time grown to be much known for his wit, and especially for his grace of speech and gift of eloquence, in which he was thought to be the best man of his time.

In November 1558, Queen Mary and Cardinal Pole died. Elizabeth succeeded, set up chiefly by the forwardness and forces of the Catholic nobility and people, who at that day, says Parsons, were without comparison the stronger party, but were content to act thus, partly on the hope of Elizabeth continuing in the Catholic religion, of which she had made much demonstration while her sister lived, and partly on a certain politic persuasion that this was the less evil, the best way to preserve peace, and exclude a foreign succession to the crown. But within a few weeks the new queen had forbidden the Host to be elevated in her presence, had chidden her preachers for their doctrine, and had excited such suspicion that a Bishop could hardly be procured to crown her. After her coronation she quite threw off the mask, and by a packed party in the "beardless parliament," and a majority of one voice in the House of Lords, from which, by threats and cajolery, she had caused the chief Catholic nobles to absent themselves, against the unanimous decision of the Bishops, and the expressed wishes of Convocation, she substituted the Anglican Establishment for the Catholic Church. But it was a long time before the law written on paper became transfused into the habits and life of the English; the utmost address and ingenuity, the most imperturbable patience, were requisite to enforce it step by step, first in one place, then in another, upon the divided and isolated population of the country.

The change was not immediately felt at Oxford, especially by the undergraduates; the authorities did not want

to make Oxford a desert by forcing too many consciences; no oath was required of Campion till he took his degree in 1564. By that time the seductions of the university, a host of friends, and a large following of disciples had entangled him. His eloquence was a dangerous gift; as junior in the act of February 19, 1564, he was orator in the schools, "at which time," says Anthony à Wood, "speaking one or more most admirable orations, to the envy of his contemporaries, he caused one of them, Tobie Mathew, to say, that rather than omit the opportunity to show his parts, and *dominari in unâ atque alterâ conciunculâ* (to be cock in a spouting-match or two), he took the oath against the supremacy of the Pope and against his own conscience." In this envious speech of Tobie's there is some truth to poison the wound. The orator's success tempted him to desert theology, to which he had addressed himself from his boyhood, and to become a humanist; and why should a humanist and a layman trouble himself with the quarrels of Pope and queen? His own path of duty was plain; he was more certain that he ought to obey his superiors, and fulfil his engagements with his pupils, than he could be about the abstract question of the Pope's supremacy. The more certain duty eclipses the less; and as a mere layman he had no particular call to certify himself more securely on so very inconvenient a point. Nevertheless, though he took the oath himself, he sometimes saved others from doing so. "I knew him at Oxford," says Parsons, "and it was through him that the oath was not tendered to me when I took my M.A. degree."

Still, however loth, he was obliged, by the statutes of the college, to enter on the study of theology; but he managed to find a respite, and to stave off the urgent questions. He began with natural theology, and read it up from Aristotle—Aristotle says nothing about the Pope's supremacy. Then he went on to positive theology, the old settled dogma, which had not much to do with the controversies of the day. Then he determined to spell through the Fathers, where he could not expect to find much about these crabbed points; this I gather from his own statement: "First I learned grammar in my native place; then I went to Oxford, where I studied philosophy for seven years (1557-1564), and theology for about six—Aristotle, Positive Theology, and the Fathers."

After he had taken his degree he had hosts of pupils, who followed not only his teaching but his example, and imitated not only his phrases but his gait. He filled Oxford with "Campionists;" he became, like Hotspur, the glass wherein the youth did dress themselves, whose speech, gait, and diet

was the copy and book that fashioned others. Among these Championists was Robert Turner, afterwards rector of the University of Ingoldstadt, who speaks of his master as the one *qui stilum meum, prius disjectum et libere effluentem extra oram artis et rationis, redegit in quadrum, aut aptius ad normam hanc rectam exegit*; he had pinched up, and pulled out, and squared into shape his pupil's slovenly style. Another was Richard Stanihurst, poet, historian, and divine; and another, Henry, son of Lord Vaux of Harrowden. None of them approach their master in his brief and brilliant phrases, and forcible and lifelike epithets; but they gathered round him and formed a classical public, a brotherhood of scholars, to excite, to appreciate, and to applaud.

St. John's College was at that time a nursery for Catholics. The founder, Sir Thomas White, a Catholic, who as Lord Mayor of London in 1553 had done good service against Sir Thomas Wyatt's rebellion, and who in Elizabeth's first Parliament had protested that "it was unjust that a religion begun in such a miraculous way, and established by such grave men, should be abolished by a set of beardless boys,"—was still alive to superintend its foundation. When Elizabeth abolished the Mass, Dr. Alexander Belsire, whom Sir Thomas had appointed first president of his college in 1555, was deprived by the Royal Commissioners, for Popery, in 1559 or 1560; and then White took away all the crucifixes, vestments, and holy vessels that he had given, and hid them in his house, to be restored in happier times.* Belsire's successor, Dr. William Ely, who was elected by the scholars and confirmed by White, was as much a Catholic as his predecessor; but he managed to hold his post till 1563 without acknowledging the queen's supremacy. In that year the oath was tendered to him, and he was ejected. William Stock, Principal of Gloucester Hall, succeeded Ely, but was also ejected in a year for Popery. In 1564 Sir Thomas White made John Robinson president; he remained so for eight years, till July 1572, when, White being dead, and the Puritan Horne, Bishop of Winchester, having succeeded in upsetting White's arrangement which deprived the Bishops of that see of the visitation of the college and vested it in trustees, of whom one of the first was to have been William Roper, the descendant of Sir Thomas More, the character of the college underwent a complete change. Tobie Mathew was made president (1572), the suspected Papists (nine out of twenty) were ejected from the fellowships, and their places

* They were given back to the college, in 1602, by Mrs. Leach, White's niece.

were filled by Puritans. Such is always the end of attempts to graft Catholic institutions upon the Establishment; a generous impulse is called forth, foundations more or less liberal are made, matters go on well while the personal presence of the founder overlooks them; but when he dies, his spirit departs, and his foundation reverts to the true representatives of Anglicanism, the pharisaical High Churchman or the fanatical Puritan. The unsoundness of the constitution which requires the constant supervision of a man of genius, is shown by its collapse under his successors. There is no home for any thing Catholic in the Establishment. It would be ridiculous to look for the spirit of Sir Thomas White, or of Edmund Campion, in the present society of St. John's College, Oxford.

In the times I am speaking of, that society, if we may believe Yepes, Bishop of Tarrasona, never would have the Lord's Supper celebrated in their chapel, nor would go elsewhere in search of it. If they had not the same objection to the Common Prayer, they avoided all topics of religious dispute, devoted themselves to philosophy and scholarship, and made Campion promise not to compromise himself in his public disputations. They were all waiting for something to turn up; waiting like the drunken man for the door to come round to them, instead of shaking off their lethargy and walking out through the open door. They were waiting for Burghley to die, or for Elizabeth to die or to marry a Catholic husband, or for the King of Spain to come and depose her; waiting for fortune to change for them, instead of trying to change their own fortune; and forgetting that fate unresisted overcomes us, but is conquered by resistance. They wanted the voice of a Demosthenes in their ears—"Will you for ever go sneaking about, and asking, 'What news?' What can be more disgraceful news than that an heretical woman is putting down the Catholics, and usurping their inheritance? Is Elizabeth dead? No, i' faith, but she is very sick; and what matters it to you? If she were dead, you would soon set up another Elizabeth, through your sloth and poltroonery. For this one has not made herself what she is; it is you that have built her up." It was this English dilatoriness, this provisional acquiescence in wrong, this stretching of the conscience in order that men might keep what they had, which lost England to the Church, as it has since lost many a man who was quite convinced that he ought to be a Catholic, but waited till his conviction faded away. The Catholics waited for the times to mend; and they waited till their children were brought up to curse the

religion of their fathers, till they had been robbed piecemeal of their wealth and power, and found themselves a waning sect in the land they had once occupied from sea to sea.

Campion's first public oratorical display at Oxford was in 1560, at the re-burial of poor Amy Robsart, Robert Dudley's murdered wife, who had been hastily stowed away at Cumnor, till the people muttering about her husband having caused Foster, his servant, to throw her down-stairs and break her neck, in order that he might enjoy the Queen's favours more freely,—as afterwards he did during his whole life,—induced him to display his love and grief by a magnificent funeral in St. Mary's Church, Oxford, when Dudley's chaplain, Dr. Babington, made her funeral oration. But either more than one oration was made over her grave, or the event was commemorated in the different colleges; for Parsons says that "Edmund Campion was chosen, though then very young, to make an English oration in her funerals, which he performed with exceeding commendation of all who were present." I have already mentioned his successes in February 1564. In the same year Sir Thomas White died, and, in conformity with his will, his body was brought from London to Oxford, "with great celebrity and a marvellous concourse of people, on account of the fame of his virtues and charities;" and because he was a known Catholic, and had done much to defend and advance his religion, therefore (says Parsons) Campion was chosen to make the funeral oration in Latin; and in it he so well "improved" the alms-deeds of Sir Thomas, "that he wonderfully moved his audience to esteem such pious deeds," and "appalled much for many days the new-fangled preachers of that time," who used to disparage the merit of good works, and had not yet arrived even at the moderate Anglican view, that a few of them do no harm.

A copy of this oration is preserved at Stonyhurst; it is in very idiomatic and elegant Latin, and my translated extracts give no idea of its excellence. The author begins with a rhetorical picture of the grief of the thirty towns which White's munificence had enriched, and then turns to the simplicity which governed this liberality. "What magnificent generosity it was for a wholly unlettered man to found this great home of literature, for a man without learning to patronise the learned, for a wealthy citizen to adopt so many strangers when he had no children of his own, and to give all he had to aliens!" He enlarges on White's childlessness, and declares that it was providential, not natural: "Wherefore? he was freed from this care that he might be wholly unencumbered for another; and this other care he so entirely

embraced, that for the last ten years he has devoted all his thoughts, all his means, all his labour upon us; when away from Oxford his soul was here, waking or sleeping he only thought of us. As soon as his last fatal paralysis attacked him, he immediately sent off for one of us. Our president was away, and I was sent instead. As soon as he saw me, the old man embraced me, and with tears spoke words that I could not hear with dry eyes, and cannot repeat without weeping. The sum was, that we should take every care that the college was not harmed, that we should be in charity among ourselves, and educate the youth intrusted to us liberally and piously. We were to tell him if there was any thing as yet unfinished, for he was prepared to supply what was needful; and there was yet time to make fresh regulations, or to repeal, remove, or change the old. He had provided for us in his will, and hoped that his wife and William Cordell, his executors, would take care of us. He begged that we would not pray for his recovery, but for faith and patience in his last moments; and nothing annoyed him so much as wishes for a renewal of health.* Then there is an apostrophe to Sir Thomas, and a summary of his charities—the foundation of Merchant-Tailors' School in London, the restoration of Gloucester Hall, and the foundation of St. John's College, Oxford. "He has beaten all of us students with our holy ways, our sacred teaching, our pious talk, and our sacrilegious life. In this man's tongue, manners, and gait, there was nothing polished, dressed up, painted, affected, or false; all was bare, open, pure, sincere, chaste, undefiled." He and Sir Thomas Pope were the only private persons who had founded colleges; but he did it at a time when there were few incentives to such an act; "when literature was despised, was in prison, in poverty, and in despair, half dead with sorrow, nearly washed out in tears."

The next great occasion of Campion's oratorical triumphs was in 1566, during the queen's visit to the university. The shows with which Oxford entertained her are of a piece with those which she afterwards witnessed at Kenilworth, and which Sir Walter Scott has made familiar to us. Wherever she went, inscriptions were put up in her honour; one that was set up over the gate of Christ Church made a painful impression on Campion. That college was one of Wolsey's two

* White, in his last letter to his college, wrote, "I have me recommended unto you even from the bottom of my heart, desiring the Holy Ghost may be among you until the end of the world, and desiring Almighty God that every one of you may love one another as brethren; and I shall desire you all to apply to your learning. . . . And if any strife or variance do arise among you, for God's sake to pacify it as much as you may."

magnificent foundations. "That at Ipswich" (says Campion) "was destroyed by Henry. The other at Oxford is without comparison grander than any college in Europe, and endowed with an income of about 3000*l*. At the present day Henry is called its founder, simply because he did not upset it and confiscate its revenues after the cardinal's death. Witness the verses carved in great letters over the entrance when Elizabeth made her visit; the last line of the inscription was, *Imperfecta tui subiens monumenta parentis* ('Enter the unfinished monument of your father'). I never saw any thing more miserable; the memory of the noble patron obliterated, and the honour given to one who had violated every principle of honour, trampled under foot all laws, human and divine, and destroyed the religion and commonwealth of England." Campion did not make allowance for the tendency which he exemplified in his own mind. In organised bodies honourable actions are attributed to the recognised head of the body, as the individual prowess of soldiers and skill of officers swell the general's credit, while the general's victories are set down to the king. The courtly Anglican naturally refers the foundation of Christ Church to Henry, the independent churchman to Wolsey; but its real founders were the men who had set up the small monasteries out of the revenues of which Wolsey, with the king's permission, endowed his colleges. But the real founders were not a representative body; they were a mere catalogue of names, without meaning or coherence, and their honour was going a-begging till some one appropriated it. Churchmen claimed it for the churchman, politicians for the king, according to the usual rule in such cases. So, Mr. Weld's splendid acts of charity towards the suffering orders and emigrant priests have in a late work been attributed to his son, the cardinal; and in a recent history of the Catholic Church in England, the existence of the lay element is ignored, except where it is to be blamed, and all its deeds are attributed to the clergy. *Κόραξ κόρακι*. According to our individual bias, we select somewhat arbitrarily our representative men; and I see nothing to wonder at in Campion, a churchman, selecting Cardinal Wolsey, or in the Oxford courtiers flattering the father of their sovereign mistress.

Besides these speaking scrolls, "the whole university forced itself every way to make the best show they could in all kinds of learned and liberal exercises, as orations, disputations, *preaches*, comedies, tragedies, and the like." There were farces and rough horse-pranks, which Elizabeth relished amazingly; there were sour theological disputes "mode-

rated" by John Jewel of Sarum; and a discussion of physical philosophy, in which Campion bore the chief share. But he had his share in the other revels, "whereof myself," says Parsons, "was then an eye-witness, though some six or seven years behind Mr. Campion in standing and in age." Wood says that he welcomed the queen in the name of the university, at her first entry into the city, as thirteen years before he had welcomed Queen Mary to London. His opinions would not be against him at court. The queen notoriously hated the Puritans, and had a taste for many of the externals of the old religion, towards the professors of which she exhibited the moderation of endeavouring to win them by gentle means without exasperating them. Campion's state of mind, however obnoxious to Jewel or Tobie Mathew, would make him the more interesting to a political coquette who prided herself on her powers of fascination. Nevertheless his friends extorted from him a promise to avoid all controverted points in his orations. Nor was the council less anxious to keep such disputes from the queen's ears. The documents remaining in the State-Paper Office are an amusing proof of the industry with which the queen's advisers incubated over this important point. One list of questions in Sir William Cecil's hand carefully eschews all theology, and begins with the inquiry, "Why is ophthalmia catching, but not dropsy or gout?" Another paper, which probably contains Jewel's scheme, proposes to affirm as many heresies as could be stuffed into the budget. The scheme finally adopted by the council was a clever one for committing the university to the political theology of the court. Its questions in divinity are, "Whether subjects may fight against wicked princes?" "The ministry is not an external power." In moral philosophy, "Princes should be declared by succession, not by election;" "The rule of the king alone is better than that of law alone." The political nature of the so-called religious movement in England is well indicated by these questions, and it shows some liberality in the government, that they were allowed to be canvassed at the university in the presence of the queen.

It must have been a relief to his friends to find that Campion was only to be the oracle of two physical mysteries—"Whether the tides are caused by the moon's motion?" and "Whether the lower bodies of the universe are regulated by the higher?" He was respondent; that is, he had first to expose his arguments briefly, then to listen and reply to the objections of his opponents. This display came off on September 3, 1566, before the queen and the handsome Lord

Robert, "the chick that sitteth next the henne," not yet Earl of Leicester, but chancellor of the university, the consoled widower of Amy Robsart, and almost a recognised suitor for the queen's hand, whose familiarity encouraged her faithful Commons, two months afterwards, to petition her to marry, even going so far as to designate him for Prince Consort, "if she intended to marry a subject." But Elizabeth took offence, and commanded him on peril of his life not to aspire to such a thing. As yet, however, the drama was not "Love's Labour lost," and so the adulatory Oxonians could treat him almost as if he were king, without making the queen jealous. Before this loving pair Campion was called out to dispute, Mr. Bully being moderator, Campion respondent; Day, Meyrick (a peppery Welshman, made Bishop of Man in 1573), Richard Bristow (afterwards a Catholic, and a dear friend of Campion, one of the founders of Douai College, and the author of the celebrated "Motives"), and Adam Squire, the attacking party. In his opening speech Campion shows more rhetoric and tact than knowledge. "The only thing that reconciled him to the unequal contest, which he had to maintain, single-handed against four pugnacious youths, was the thought that he was speaking in the name of Philosophy, the princess of letters, before Elizabeth, a lettered princess, whose blessed ancestors were adepts in science, who set her the example of visiting the poor scholars." Then he addressed the magnificent chancellor, whose godly and deathless benefactions to the university he could not deny if he would, and ought not to conceal if he could. It was he who had raised Oxford from her lethargy, and encouraged her progress. "May God preserve these benefits to us; may He preserve your Majesty [to the queen], your Honour [to Dudley],—you, our mother; you, our protector,—you, who do these things; you, who advise them," &c. This oratorical see-saw was great clap-trap no doubt, but it effected its purpose. The queen was visibly affected, and turned with smiles to Lord Robert,—“You, my lord, must still be one;” words of no great weight, but which thrilled through an ambitious heart, and kindled in it no unkindly feeling to the young orator, who was perorating to so much better purpose than when, six years before, he was pronouncing the panegyric of poor Amy Robsart. Campion did not notice the queen's interruption, but proceeded with his pendulum: "You, who preserve us; you, who honour us; you, who give us security; you, who give us happiness." If *bene esse* is better than *esse*, Campion certainly preferred the chancellor to the queen, and she showed how deeply she was in love by smiling at the

preference. "For all these things," continued the speaker, "we have no money, or dresses, or such-like presents to give; we can only give what we have within us, something from the veins and bowels of philosophy." Then he eviscerates philosophy after this fashion: "The moon rules the tides. How do you know? The astronomers tell us that she rules moisture; the physicians, that the humours of the body flow more freely at the changes of the moon; the naturalists, that she expands the sea-water. Directly beneath her, therefore, the sea is always blown out with vapours, like water boiling in a pot. This is the cause of tides." With equal brevity he infers that "the heaven rules all lower bodies," and concludes by asking his hearers' best attention for the sturdy youths who are to oppose him. This shows the low ebb of knowledge at Oxford, where an opinion was asserted which had been exploded three centuries earlier in the continental schools. "The ancients said," writes St. Thomas, "that certain winds are generated in the sea which cannot break loose, but cause the ebb and flow; but this opinion is false."

After the dispute, the queen expressed her admiration of Campion's eloquence, and commended him particularly to Lord Robert, who willingly undertook to patronise the scholar. Campion certainly deserved some gratitude for the confession he had drawn from the queen; and his religious tendencies were not then offensive to Dudley, who "was for some years the secret friend of the Papists against the Protestants, till he was for policy persuaded by Lord North and his other friends to step over to the Puritans against both." He therefore sent for Campion, told him how grateful he ought to be to the queen, who had commissioned Dudley to find out what she could do for him; he was urged to use this favour while it lasted, and to increase it by cultivation. "Do not be too modest," he said, "for it is not only the queen's command but my own inclination to befriend you. Ask what you like for the present. The queen and I will provide for the future." But Campion would not make any particular request. The friendship of the chancellor, he said, was worth more than all gifts. Dudley of course was pleased to gain a brilliant client at no cost. For four years from this time the Earl of Leicester (Dudley's new title) showed him no little kindness, as Campion acknowledges in his dedication of his *History of Ireland* to the earl in May 1571;—"There is none that knoweth me familiarly, but he knoweth withal how many ways I have been beholden to your lordship. The regard of your deserts and of my duty hath easily won at my hands this testimony of a thankful mind. I might be thought ambitious

if I should recount in particular the times and places of your several courtesies to me. How often at Oxford, how often at the court, how at Rycot, how at Windsor, how by letters, how by reports, you have not ceased to further with advice, and to countenance with authority, the hope and expectation of me, a single student. Therefore, in sum, it shall suffice me to acknowledge the general heap of your bounties, and for them all to serve your honour frankly, at least with a true heart. Let every man esteem in your state and fortune the thing that best contenteth and serveth his imagination; but surely to a judgment settled and rectified, these outward felicities which the world gazeth on are there and therefore to be deemed praiseable when they lodge those inward qualities of the mind, which (saving for suspicion of flattery) I was about to say are planted in your breast. Thirteen years to have lived in the eye and special credit of a prince, yet never during all that space to have abused this ability to any man's harm; to be enriched with no man's overthrow, to be kindled neither with grudge nor emulation, to benefit an infinite resort of daily suitors, to let down your calling to the need of mean subjects, to retain so lowly a stomach, such a facility, so mild a nature in so high a vocation, to undertake the tuition of learning and learned men,—these are indeed the kernels for the which the shell of your nobility seemeth fair and sightly; this is the sap for whose preservation the bark of your noble tree is tendered; this is the substance which maketh you worthy of those ornaments wherewith you are attired; and in respect of these good gifts, as I for my part have ever been desirous to discover an officious and dutiful mind towards your lordship, so will I never cease to betake the uttermost of my power and skill to your service."

Campion's admiration of Leicester is certainly a weak point in his character. His great superiority of intellect and his scholarship were united, say his biographers, with great modesty, and an easy pliability to the wishes of others. Protestant and Catholic writers alike praise his humility, his sweetness, his amiable manners, and his maidenly meekness. Charity thinks no evil, and reverence gives honour to great place. If St. Alphonsus might dedicate a book with fulsome flattery to Tanucci without suspicion to his sanctity and simplicity, I do not see how we can quarrel with Campion for this preface, though we know now that his patron had murdered his wife in 1560, by means of that exquisite villain Sir Richard Varney, and had become so notorious to the more knowing ones, that when Elizabeth proposed him for a husband of Mary Queen of Scots, Sir Nicholas Throgmorton

wrote to beseech her *in visceribus Christi* to prevent it, if she did not want her council to be *opprobrium hominum et abjectio plebis*, infamous for forcing a queen to marry a murderer, a poisoner, and a sorcerer.

But these crimes were not public; those were days of more than ordinary hypocrisy, and the secret workings of intrigue were harder to discover. Leicester appeared open and free, his manners were engaging, his treatment of dependents liberal. He was unpopular with his monopolies; but if any one had a suit to recommend, Leicester was the mediator; if a poor scholar had written a treatise, Leicester was his patron; if a Bishop sighed for his temporalities, Leicester was the man to get them. A position like his creates a circle of admirers blind to faults, and incredulous to rumours of inconsistent conduct.

Parsons remembers "the infinite praises that of all men were given to Campion at this time." When the queen asked Guzman, the Spanish ambassador, what he thought of the Oxford exercises, "Very well," he replied; "but I marvel not thereat considering the variety of good wits and talents there discovered, and that all the speakers came very well prepared beforehand; but I should desire to hear somewhat done extempore and without preparation." On this a number of men were at once sent for to Merton College, where, in presence of the ambassador, Dudley, Cecil, and others, they were made to dispute upon "fire." "No wonder they wax warm with such a subject," said Guzman. "Campion bore away most praise in this sudden encounter, as he did a little after for a certain rare oration that he was forced to extemporise before the queen at Woodstock, in which he was like to have lost himself utterly, partly through the haste, partly by the sudden great pomp wherewith the queen come forth to hear him, until after a few moments (as he was wont to tell) he remembered that she was but a woman, and he a man, which is the better sex, and that all the splendour and pomp which glittered in his eyes was but transitory vanity, and had no substance in it, by which, and similar cogitations, he was emboldened to go through with his speech, to the great contentation of the queen and court, and his own high commendation."

Cecil, as well as Dudley, took great interest in Campion's success, and "invited him with many hopes and promises to follow that course." Four years afterwards, when Campion had left England, Cecil said to Campion's pupil, Stanihurst, "It is a very great pity to see so notable a man leave his country, for indeed he was one of the diamonds of England."

Yet in 1581 Cecil was the chief author of his death, against the wishes of others of the council, as Parsons was told "by one that heard with his own ears the consultation about that matter." On the whole, in 1564, Campion was the most popular man in Oxford, where no man envied his triumphs. He did not reside long enough to take his doctor's degree; but he was made proctor and public orator, the highest posts compatible with his standing.

All these successes, says F. Parsons, put Campion into exceeding danger, by enticing him to follow a course of which his conscience disapproved; "for he was always a sound Catholic in his heart, and utterly condemned all the form and substance of the queen and council's new religion; and yet the sugared words of the great folks, especially of the queen, joined with pregnant hopes of speedy and great preferments, so enticed him that he knew not which way to turn." His youth, ambition, desire to satisfy the expectations of his friends, and emulation at the advance of his equals and inferiors pulled him back; while remorse of conscience, fear of hell, and an invincible persuasion of the truth of the Catholic doctrine and the falsehood of the Protestant opinion, pushed him onwards. He determined to compromise matters by temporising; his internal combat was long and dangerous, for he lacked the aid of the Sacraments and of spiritual direction; and though he prayed earnestly for light, yet he still hearkened to both sides inwardly, to see whether he could find sufficient reasons to allow his conscience to follow in peace the course to which his worldly interests so strongly inclined him.

This was the case also with Parsons for some years, and with many others, especially at the universities;—with young men, well accommodated in fellowships or otherwise, and provoked by infinite inducements to seek the preferments which the place and the country yielded, or at least to keep what they had; yet feeling that the religion on which these preferments depended was doubtful and therefore dangerous: hence they lived in great toil and torment of mind, loth to lose the hope of salvation, glad to hold their commodities without molestation of conscience, if it might be, ever in suspense, ever ready to listen to any reason that promised to remove their scruples.

The only safe anchor in this troubled water was, in Parsons's opinion, the study of the Fathers. "Whatever we had heard or conceived in the whole day for pulling out this thorn of conscience, and for smoothing the way to be Protestant, either by good fellowship and conversation with

Protestants themselves, or by hearing their sermons or reading their books, all this was dashed by one hour's reading of some work of the old holy doctors, and the wound of conscience was made green again, and as grievous as ever, by every page which spake of virtue and austerity, or of questions of controversy, which were settled there as clearly as if the Fathers had distinctly foreseen the tumults of these days."

It was in 1567 that Campion, having exhausted Aristotle and natural theology, had to turn to these authentic reporters of the Christian tradition; and for three whole years he was distracted with the various arguments for and against the open profession of his Catholic belief. He had begun with a conscientious examination of the controverted doctrines one by one; the unhistorical and illogical character of the new tenets was soon discovered; and as truth begets truth, and as a mind once cheated ever suspects fraud, he examined the points which he had been used to take for granted; here too the ground failed beneath him. But the consequences of his step were too fatal to his worldly interests to allow of any hurry. He consulted his friends. He went to any one, no matter what his views, who professed to be able to tell him something; but every conference pushed him on a step further.

An extract from his *Decem Rationes* will illustrate this: "When I was young," he says, "John Jewell, the Calvinist leader in England, was impudent enough to challenge the Catholics to a proof of their respective tenets from the works of the Fathers of the first six centuries. The challenge was accepted by some well-known men then in exile and poverty at Louvain. I venture to say that Jewell's craft, ignorance, roguery, and impudence, as exposed by those writers, did more good to the Catholic cause than any thing within my remembrance. A proclamation was immediately posted on the doors that none of the answers should be read or kept, though they had been squeezed out by a direct challenge. Every thinking man could see plainly that the Fathers were Catholic. . . .

"Once also I familiarly questioned Tobie Mathew, now your greatest preacher, whose learning and good disposition endeared him to me, and asked him to tell me sincerely how a man who was such an assiduous student of the Fathers could take the side which he defended as true. He answered, 'If I believed them as well as read them, you would have good reason to ask me.' This is perfectly true; and I think he must still be of the same mind."

This challenge naturally called up Tobie, who answered in a *concio apologetica*, which Wood quotes, and which Parsons describes as rather vehement and rhetorical than with any show of sincerity. Of course he denied the charge. "Who affirmed it? Edmund Campion the Jesuit. And who denies it? Tobie Mathew the Christian. I avouch that neither sleeping or waking, standing or sitting, by day or by night, at home or abroad, in jest or in earnest, did I ever say it." However, Campion who had asserted it was dead for his faith, and Mathew was enjoying benefices and prospects which might be risked by the story being believed. And according to Parsons, Campion's friend Stanihurst declared that he had heard it from Campion at the very time of its occurrence.

Another of Campion's Christ-Church friends was reputed to be as cunning in the Scriptures as Mathew in the Fathers; this was Tarleton the "governor" of the young Sir Philip Sidney. He professed to prove his religion from the Bible alone, without the Fathers. Campion and he had an argument, in which "each party was to allege bare Scripture, only allowing the aid of tongues, comparison of text with text, and prayer." When Campion had produced many strong passages on the Catholic side, and had shown that they could not be evaded in Greek or Hebrew, and perceived that Tarleton could not bring any so clear for his side, and could only oppose wrangling interpretations out of his own head, Campion, says Parsons, resolved fully that, seeing both Scriptures and Fathers were wholly against the Protestant side, he would never follow it for temporal respects.

Campion had access to Leicester's ante-room whenever he pleased; here perhaps he met with Richard Cheney, the Bishop of Gloucester, a man of congenial nature, tastes, and studies. Cheney was a mild, persuasive, old man, very different from the rest of the Elizabethan Bishops, from whom he held aloof, as if he had been of a different communion. In the Convocation of 1553 he had tried to commit the Anglican body to the Lutheran doctrine of consubstantiation, but he was so far from being either Lutheran or Calvinist in other respects that in 1568 his flock complained of the "very strange, perilous, and corrupt doctrine, contrary to the Gospel," which he preached in his cathedral of Bristol, where his own fanatical clergy withstood him to the face. He warned his hearers that the new writers differed from each other, and were therefore not safe guides, but that the old fathers and doctors alone were to be followed; that any heretic might avouch Scripture, and that controversy would

be endless without the appeal to the Fathers ; that Luther wrote a very ill book against free will, which Erasmus answered well ; and that the consent of the Fathers was the only test by which he would be tried.

There was one more statement with which Cheney's Puritanical accusers were scandalised, though it was addressed, not so much to the Puritans, as to those numerous loose Catholics who would not give up the old faith, but were unwilling to submit to the penalties for not going to church. There was always a large party of this sort in England ; and in 1562 some of their chief men had consulted the Fathers of the Council of Trent upon the matter, and had asked whether they might not with a safe conscience attend the common prayer and preaching. A committee was appointed to reply, who firmly but kindly pronounced it quite inadmissible for any Catholic to assist at the "new service, the offspring of schism, and the badge of hatred to the Church." But one proclamation was quite insufficient to remove the deep-rooted prejudice. The decision was confirmed by St. Pius V. in 1566, and Dr. Harding and Dr. Sanders were sent over to publish it afresh ; it was solemnly recognised in a council of priests, convened by Parsons and Campion in July 1580, again promulgated by Cardinal Tolet, June 14, 1581 ; enforced in a circular of Dr. Allen, written by the Pope's direction, in 1592, and finally confirmed by Paul V. in a brief addressed to the English Catholics in September 1606. Besides all this, many books were printed, and many more circulated in manuscript, on the same question. From this we may judge how many English Catholics persisted in thinking that they might save their freedom and their goods by being present at common prayer and sermons. Cheney encouraged this idea. He would have recoiled from subverting what remained of Catholic faith. He only undermined it. He did not deny that attendance at the Protestant services was like bowing down in the house of Rimmon ; but he quoted the example of Naaman to show that political motives might excuse a man's presence at a worship which his conscience abhorred.

"A question may be asked between the young maid and Naaman, whether a godly man may be at idol-service with his body, his heart being with God, without offence or sin ? I say he may ; and because you shall not think I am of this opinion only, I will bring you Peter Martyr, a learned man, and as famous as ever was in our time, being your own doctor [he had been Professor of Divinity at Oxford] ; he says, a man may be present without offence. His words are these : 'Non enim simpliciter et omnibus modis

interdictum est hominibus ne in fanis præsentes adsint, dum profani et execrandi ritus exercentur.' ”

This was just the doctrine that Campion wanted. The two men agreed in execrating the innovators, and yet maintaining the duty of remaining in the Establishment. Was it not the ancient national Church, founded by apostolic authority, to be the repository of the faith and sacraments? If her vineyard was now usurped by the beasts of the forests, if the wild-boar was uprooting her vines, should her children forsake her in her affliction? No; though heretical Calvinists occupied her pulpits, her children need not desert their old homes. If Naaman might attend his king to the house of Rimmon, much more might we accompany our tyrant to our own churches, though heretics for a season occupied our places, and botchers had disfigured our ancient rites. Thus was the instance of Naaman generalised into a universal dispensation for all sects to huddle together, provided it was within the stone walls built for God's service in Catholic times. With all his patristic learning, I suppose Cheney had never lighted on the words of St. Hilary: “It is ill that a love of walls has seized you; it is ill that your veneration for God's Church lies in houses and buildings; it is ill that under this plea ye insinuate the name of peace. Is there any doubt that Antichrist is to sit in these? Mountains and woods, and lakes, and prisons are to me more safe; for in these the prophets, sojourning or sunk, still by God's Spirit prophesy.”

The acquaintance soon ripened into affection; Campion was continually visiting Cheney at Gloucester, reading in the Bishop's study, and borrowing books from his library, enjoying the closest familiarity, sharing the old man's sorrows, and listening to his complaints of the calumnies that assailed him. The Bishop exhorted his young friend never for a moment to swerve from the royal road of Church Councils and Fathers, and ever to put full faith in their consent. Campion saw the inconsistency of this advice, yet he allowed himself to be persuaded. He saw that the weapons which Cheney wielded against Puritans might be better used by Catholics against Cheney; he saw, and hesitated; yet he could not make up his mind to tell Cheney his doubts, to warn him of the untenableness of his position, or to entreat him, now that he was so near the kingdom of God, to take but one more step and secure it for ever.

Indeed, so far from Campion influencing his friend, Cheney had, on the contrary, fixed his eyes upon Campion as the man to carry on his work. Cheney alone of the Eliza-

bethan Bishops had the slightest pretensions to orthodoxy; alone confessed the living presence of Christ upon the altar, and the freedom of man's will; alone refused to persecute the Catholics of his diocese, or to waste his episcopal property by leases, exchanges, sales of lands, of timber, or even of the lead off the church-roof. He was planting that school in the Establishment whose latest fruits are the present Tractarians. Campion was to water what he had planted. He yielded half reluctantly to the Bishop's persuasions, and suffered himself to be ordained deacon, so as to be capable of preferment, and to be able to preach; not thinking, as he afterwards said, "that the matter had been as odious and abominable as it was."

As soon as he was ordained, troubles began to beset him; inwardly, "he took a remorse of conscience and detestation of mind." Outwardly, his familiarity with Cheney, and the reports of his opinions, made him suspected by his London friends. He still held his exhibition from the Grocer's Company, when in 1568 rumours of his heterodoxy reached the court of assistants, and they began to question him. Their records say that "to accord and clear the suspicions conceived of Edmund Campion, one of the Company's scholars, and that he may utter his mind in favouring the religion now authorised, it is agreed that between this and Candlemas next he shall come and preach at Paul's Cross, in London, or else the Company's exhibition to cease, and be appointed to another; and that he shall have warning thereof from Mr. Warden." Campion disliked the ordeal proposed; and a subsequent entry states that he, "being one of the Company's scholars, and suspected to be of unsound judgment in religion, petitioned them to postpone" the "clearing of himself herein by preaching at Paul's Cross unto Michaelmas." This was agreed to. Afterwards Campion attended a court of the Company "to know their pleasure as to this business;" he expressed great disinclination to preach at the Cross, and entreated, at all events, to be allowed more time for preparation. The court, taking in good part that he did not absolutely refuse, offered that he should preach first "at a less notable place than Paul's Cross," namely, St. Stephen's Church, Walbrook. Campion objected to this on the plea of being "a public person that could not do what he would, and, besides, charged with the education of divers worshipful men's children," and asked for a longer time. The Company would not consent to this, so he requested a note in writing, containing the precise demands they had to make; when finding that he could not comply with them, he re-

signed his exhibition, to which the Company appointed another man.

But he was soon to make a still more important resignation. Fully occupied as he must have been with his academical duties—he was Proctor in 1568-69—and with his pupils, and devoted as he was to the course of education, his duties did not occupy his whole attention, or stifle his misgivings of conscience and his distress. When he retired into himself, his thoughts were none of the pleasantest. He is reported to have declared more than once that soon after his ordination he began to feel extraordinary mental anguish: his orders appeared disorders, whose only cure was Catholicism. The dignities he once dreamed of had lost their allurements. If his ambition had once been to continue Cheney's work, and to succeed to his bishopric, now he plainly saw how Babylonish a captivity those gilded chains disguised. He was one of those favoured men whose falls are the direct occasions of their rise, and who may truly exclaim, "O felix culpa!"

"O benefit of ill, now I find true
That evil is by evil still made better,
And ruined love, when it is built anew,
Grows fairer than before, more strong, far greater."

The Grocers were driving him, his conscience was goading him, and his dearest friend was beckoning him away. Campion and Gregory Martin had been college companions for thirteen years, where they had their meals, their books, their ideas in common; they had studied under the same masters, had loved the same friends, were hated by the same enemies. Martin, like Campion, was a man of mark, "of extraordinary modesty and moderation," "the Hebraist, the Grecian, the poet, the honour and glory" of St. John's College. He had accepted a place in the Duke of Norfolk's family as governor to his boys; and though Philip, afterwards Earl of Arundel, did him no present credit, the young nobleman bore witness, by his holy death in 1595, to the good husbandry of his early tutor. In 1569, when the duke's troubles about the Queen of Scots began, all his household were commanded to attend common prayer and sermons; Martin, therefore, fled over the seas, and became a Catholic. And from Douai he wrote to Campion to warn him against the ambition that was leading him astray into the wide path where so many great wits had perished in those evil days. He begged him not to fear for poverty; their friendship was too pure to admit such difficulties. "If we two can but live together," he wrote, "we can live on

nothing ; if this is too little, I have money ; if this fails, one thing is left,—‘*Qui seminant in lacrymis, in exultatione metent,*’—they that sow in tears shall reap in joy.”

Thus driven and thus drawn, Campion left Oxford, on the feast of St. Peter in Chains, August 1, 1569, on the termination of his proctorial office, of which he rendered an account in the usual Latin oration. But though Father Parsons gives this date for his finally quitting Oxford, his connection with the university probably continued some time longer, as I shall show in my next chapter.

R. S.

Correspondence.

CATHOLIC EDUCATION.

SIR,—In requesting to bear a part in the controversy raised by “X. Y. Z.,” I do so under protest. I cannot recognise the propriety of ecclesiastical education being called in question, as to its most fundamental principles, by the anonymous correspondents of a lay periodical. My own purpose in writing, therefore, is purely defensive. I heartily wish that the general body of your readers could remain in that state of mind, in which they were before “X. Y. Z.’s” first communication. But since his two letters may have imbued many persons with his own opinions ; and since I believe those opinions to be most mistaken, pernicious, and anti-Catholic ; my wish, and my only wish, is to do all in my power that this effect may be neutralised.

I find myself differing from “X. Y. Z.” so essentially and fundamentally, that my difficulty is to find any point of agreement from which our argument may proceed. To discover such point of agreement, I must go back very far indeed ; and I must crave therefore the indulgence of your readers, if I start with the enunciation of certain very elementary truths.

1. We are fulfilling the end for which God created us, so far, and so far only, as we make it our one business and pursuit to grow in loving and serving God ; in conquering our various habits of sin and imperfection ; in bringing the thought of the invisible world to influence our whole life in this visible scene. The various mental constitutions which God has given us, the various external circumstances in which He has placed us,—these are indeed most widely different from each other. And consequently, the particular sphere within which we are to work out our sanctification, the particular duties which are to be our training towards perfection, the particular methods of mental discipline which we are to practise,—all these are most widely different also. But such differences do

not affect in the slightest degree the great principle above stated. That principle is no less true in the case of layman than of priest, in the case of secular than of religious. The one main work which God has given here below to all of us alike, is the labouring for our own sanctification. And as He has assigned to us the work, so also He has given us the fullest means of accomplishing it, by those plentiful supplies of grace, which He is far more ready to give than we (alas!) to ask. Nor has He been contented with this. He has so constituted our nature, that the life to which He calls us is the life far most conducive even to our earthly happiness. The affections, when concentrated on Him who is their true Scope instead of being dissipated on worldly objects, afford ordinarily a degree of tranquil, long-continued, uncloying satisfaction, which worldly men do not even imagine.

“Nec lingua potest dicere,
Nec littera exprimere,
Expertus potest credere,
Quid sit Jesum diligere.”

2. The great majority of men give small attention indeed to this great work, and experience very little craving for this true and lasting enjoyment. The chief interest and occupation of their thoughts, is the pursuit of those various worldly objects which are accessible: sensual gratification; intellectual gratification; the praise of men; the exercise of power; the pleasurable sense of their own dignity; and the like. Great numbers, specially of non-Catholics, follow these objects quite recklessly and unreservedly, being altogether indifferent how grievously they offend God in the pursuit. There is some not inconsiderable number, however, who take a higher standard; who sincerely strive, with greater or less success, against the commission of mortal sin. But the great majority, even of these men, take very little account of that great principle on which I have been insisting. Of this great majority, it may be said no less truly than of the former class, that the chief interest and occupation of their thoughts lie in the pursuit of worldly objects; that the methodically applying to the work of their own sanctification holds a most subordinate place, or rather no place at all, in their plan of life; and that they are not in any way striving to make the case otherwise. Whatever else may be said of such men, one thing is included in the very terms of my statement. They assign a most subordinate place, or rather no place at all, to that which God intended to be the one business and interest of their life.

3. Fallen man is most miserably prone to the pursuit of these worldly objects; their natural influence over his will is most constant and powerful. It is only therefore by repeated and unwearyed recourse to prayer, self-examination, meditation, that real advance can be made in the interior life. Let such exercises be suspended, rapid at once is our decline towards the worldly vortex. And this decline is the decay of happiness no less than of virtue;

for by one of those strange paradoxes which abound in our inward life, the direct pursuit of earthly enjoyment is the worst possible means of obtaining it.

I can have no doubt that "X. Y. Z.," as being a Catholic, will admit the substantial truth of these principles ; and they may furnish, therefore, that point of agreement which I was seeking. For I am able to deduce from them at once a conclusion, which is of extreme moment in the present controversy.

We see, then, that there is one arduous yet most happy occupation, which God intended to be the main work and interest of our lives ; which the enormous majority of men miserably neglect ; and in which careful instruction and manuduction is of the greatest advantage. Christian education, therefore, will be good, in precise proportion as it forwards this great work. There are therefore two principal and paramount tests, whereby we should estimate the value of any educational proposal. First, we should consider how far the proposed system of education will help its recipients towards making progress in that great work of their lives, their own sanctification ; and secondly, we should consider how far it will help them towards influencing others in the same holy direction. The second of these ends is in all cases of great moment ; for that the good should be influential and the bad otherwise, is *the* one paramount social blessing. But in the case of priests this second end assumes quite a special importance, because it is their very profession to impress religious truth on the great body of Catholics.

The main staple of my letter will consist, then, in appreciating "X. Y. Z.'s" theories by these two tests. And I think that the three following particulars will embrace all the proposals on which he lays stress, in regard to the principles on which ecclesiastical education should be conducted. First, he urges—I use under protest his own language—that clerical students should be governed on "the principle of confidence," and not on "the principle of police." Secondly, that far greater scope should be given to the development of the affections, than is now the case. Thirdly, that there should be far greater facility and encouragement for the study of miscellaneous literature. On each of these particulars I will join issue, and advocate opinions contradictory to his in the very extremest degree. First, I will consider these three proposals in their bearing on the priest's individual character, and afterwards in their bearing on his general influence.

First, then, "X. Y. Z." desires, that clerical students should be governed on "the principle of confidence," and not on "the principle of police." These terms are by no means fairly chosen to express his meaning ; but that meaning is sufficiently clear. By the "principle of police," he means the habit of superiors being on principle constantly in the students' company. By the "principle of confidence," he means the opposite habit;—the habit of leaving the students without superiors for a very considerable portion of each

day, to form a kind of commonwealth by themselves. Accordingly, he holds up, not for our warning but for our imitation, the example of Protestant public schools in England, where such is both the practice and the theory. Such then as I have stated is undoubtedly my opponent's meaning; though there is one passage in his last letter, which looks in quite an opposite direction. To this passage I shall specially refer in due course.

Now, in the first place, there is one most important purpose, at which all Catholic seminaries aim in the whole matter of government. There are necessarily a great number of rules on the various details of daily life: what is to be the time of study, what of recreation; what is forbidden in the former period, and what in the latter; and numberless particulars of a similar nature. It is held in Catholic seminaries to be a most important method of sanctification to the student, that he should be trained to obey these various rules, on supernatural motives, and for God's sake. This habit, it is considered, will give him most important help, towards recollection of God's Presence, mortification of the will, and other invaluable blessings. Some superiors regard the violation of the rules as a venial sin, others as only a grave imperfection. But all agree in the essential principle, that this observance of rule, for God's sake, is a very important part of ecclesiastical training, and that no one who habitually neglects it should be admitted to ordination.

Does "X. Y. Z.," or does he not, consider that Catholic seminaries have rightly judged in all this? He has not even adverted to it. Yet it is no minor or subordinate particular in their administration, but among its most prominent and characteristic features. He cannot wish us, I suppose, to *take for granted* that the whole thing is a complete mistake, without our hearing one single argument against it. I must assume, therefore, for the purpose of my reasoning, that he admits the great and important benefits derived from this method of sanctification.

Yet let this once be admitted, my opponent's proposal assumes quite a grotesque appearance. He cannot gravely say, that if a number of untrained students are left to themselves, they will spontaneously learn to observe with careful exactness a number of minute rules, with the view of promoting their own sanctification. Plainly the opposite result will ensue; and the constant presence of those in authority (with the younger students at least) is absolutely necessary, if this method of sanctification is to be practised. Those persons in authority need not necessarily be the superiors themselves; it will suffice, if they are commissioned by the superiors, imbued with their spirit, and enjoying their confidence. Their presence will act as a removal of temptation; an encouragement to the well-disposed; a check and restraint on those who are inclined to neglect and disobedience.

But in commenting on this opposite principle, the principle of surveillance, "X. Y. Z." most strangely supposes, that the rulers of a college content themselves with the infliction of punishment when-

ever transgression is discovered ; and that they never explain and enforce the immense spiritual benefit of obedience. I make a most opposite supposition. I suppose, as a matter of course, that they urge this in every possible way :—in formal conferences and sermons ; in private and familiar conversation ; most efficaciously of all, by their own example, by the steadiness and regularity with which they themselves conform to all the regulations of the house. If any where the case be otherwise,—and “F.” thinks that in some places it is otherwise,—here is a most serious practical corruption which clamours for reform. But I will venture to say that no seminary ever advocated *on principle* any such disastrous omission.

Let us now come to the more general question. Let us see how the whole ecclesiastical spirit will be affected, by the practice of surveillance on the one side, or the practice of allowing unchecked mutual intercourse on the other side. I suppose that such tempers as the following will be admitted by all good Catholics, as among the most prominent constituents of the true Christian character, and most especially, therefore, of the true ecclesiastical spirit. First and foremost, most sensitive purity : and this virtue, I need not say, assumes quite a position by itself and separate from all others, in the case of those who are being trained for celibacy. Other such qualities will be (2) constant recollectedness and remembrance of God's Presence ; (3) a deep practical conviction, that interior perfection is *the* one important thing, and (by consequence) the valuing of every other object simply in proportion to its bearing on that end ; (4) a burning desire that sanctity and love of God may be widely diffused among men ; (5) an abiding and deeply-seated sense of sin, and a consequent tendency to welcome all the sufferings which may befall as most justly deserved. It would be most easy to proceed with the enumeration of such tempers, but my general meaning is sufficiently explained.

Now it is difficult to imagine any arrangement more efficacious for diffusing this spirit, than that professed in Catholic seminaries. It is, that eminently holy and interior men shall be chosen as superiors, and that they shall be on terms of constant and familiar intercourse with the students. The effect of example is proverbially far more important than that of precept ; and the unstudied manifestations of deep piety are far more persuasive and influential than its formal inculcation. By living with such men, we catch as it were the holy infection, and we love virtue in its attractive embodiment. But all this has been stated by “F.” with far greater force and attractiveness of language than I can hope to command. I will only add, therefore, that I cannot even guess at my opponent's meaning, when he says that such a system as this “helps to deaden the sense of responsibility,” and “checks rather than fosters the development of character.” These serious evils, I think, exist in great intensity, not under this, but under the opposite system : as I now proceed to argue.

What, then, will ordinarily befall, in proportion as students are

left to themselves? On the particular virtue of purity, here is most awful matter for consideration. A hint will suffice for what I wish to convey. Your readers, if they will think for one moment, must readily see what fearful perils will be constantly imminent, and how impossible it will be to guard against the entrance of some youth, whose imagination is already polluted. From one such youth the disease will spread with the rapidity and malignity of a pestilence.

But we may dwell on consequences less appalling than these. Human nature, in proportion as it is left to itself, tends to worldly things, and recoils from spiritual. In all of us piety declines, if we are not brought into contact, as with the invisible power of Grace, so also with the visible influence of books or persons breathing a higher spirit than ourselves. The wretched students whom I am imagining will lose the glorious liberty of the Gospel, and become the degraded worshipers of cleverness and of "pluck." Take some one of the number, endued with great physical energy and with quick superficial talents; one, at the same time, who little values purity of intention and communion with God: here is the one who will carry every thing before him. They are to be removed from the wholesome influence of those older and better than themselves; and, behold, here is the sorry idol which they will bow down to and worship. They will become distrustful of their own higher aspirations, and ashamed of being simply on God's side. A base and cowardly atmosphere of human respect will stifle their energies, and render impossible all free growth and development of the interior life. And thus our priests will themselves be formed on those very principles, which it is their highest duty to denounce, to expose, and to resist.

I am very confident that all the phenomena of Protestant public schools most thoroughly bear out the above statement. I was myself educated at one of these, and I have at various times come across many facts relating to them; and it is my firm conviction, that more utterly detestable educational institutions never existed. I had intended to enter at some length on this theme; but have, on reconsideration, thought it better to change my plan. All which "X. Y. Z." claims as "certain" is, that "it is *quite possible* for a boy to pass through one of them unscathed," and that "*some* actually do"! But he fairly states, that however great were the proved superiority of Catholic colleges in point of morality, he should ascribe such superiority wholly to the difference of creed. I should be wasting my time, then, in adducing facts against these schools; because I shall always, of course, be open to the retort, that the evils complained of arise from their Protestantism, and not from their disciplinary arrangements. Certainly I am glad of any excuse, which may save me from the odious task of going into greater detail.

I am inclined, so far as I am acquainted with facts, to agree strongly with "F." on the great importance of bringing to bear, here in England, some more satisfactory arrangement for vacations. But I cannot in the least concur with a further remark which he makes, nor can I wonder that "X. Y. Z." claims it as a concession of the

whole point at issue. "F." thinks that if the vacation arrangements are to remain in their present state, the system of surveillance at college should be a good deal relaxed. Surely common sense would dictate the very contrary conclusion. Taking vacation evils at their worst, they will only afford a stronger reason for promoting more earnestly the constant intercourse of superiors with students during the rest of the year. If there is great danger that, during one short period, the students may fall into bad company,—that is only the stronger reason why we should well saturate them (while we can) with the wholesome influences of good society.

I can find nothing in my opponent's two letters which, even on the surface, would appear an objection to these arguments, except one single remark. He says that youths of saintly disposition "are the exception and not the rule;" and that the system pursued in all Catholic seminaries "may occasionally make a saint by accident, but its natural tendency is to make sneaks by the score." Let me reply to this.

Of course, under all circumstances, the number of saintly men, or of men who in practice are pretty thoroughly consistent, is comparatively small. But I am very confident, both from theory and facts, that in a seminary, efficiently conducted on existing principles, a very large majority of students will at least thoroughly admire and revere the interior spirit; and that they will practise to a considerable extent, some more others less consistently, the spiritual lessons which they are taught. As for those, comparatively much fewer, who will not choose to be raised so high as this, they will be sent away; and the Church will be saved from the calamity of having such men for priests. Indeed, I have "X. Y. Z.'s" own authority for this favourable statement, on the moral and spiritual working of our seminaries. The French clergy are educated to a man on that "Continental system" which he denounces; yet he tells us that "of their zeal and devotion it is impossible to speak too highly." So far, then, from this system being adapted only to a few exceptional cases, it is fitted to train a whole clergy into habits of most admirable zeal and devotion. Either my opponent must say that "sneaks" may be most excellent priests, or he must recant his original statement.

In fact, as to this word "sneaks," I should like some explanation. What is the precise evil, described by Scripture or by ascetical writers as injurious to spiritual advancement, which my opponent denotes by that word? And again, what are those "manly virtues" which young persons will learn, by the mere fact of being left to themselves? And what exact place have these virtues in the formation of a true ecclesiastical spirit? I cannot even guess. The word "sneaks," I suppose, is taken from the vocabulary of Protestant schoolboys; and I am most happy to think, that any one of our ordinary ecclesiastical students would be regarded by *them* as a "sneak." As far as my knowledge and experience extends, any one would be so designated by the generality of Protestant schoolboys, in proportion as he should more fully carry out the spirit of our

Lord's counsel : " if any man strike thee on one cheek, turn to him the other also ; and whoever shall force thee to go one mile, go with him other two."

In one remark of " X. Y. Z.," he seems to think that there is some kind of connection, between the fact of a superior living ordinarily with students, and the totally different fact of his distrusting their word. This is quite an unaccountable misapprehension. I fully admit that the result would be very evil, if young men found that a regular and conscientious life did not gain for them confidence ; if their movements were still watched with suspicion, and their assertions received with doubt. Here is one advantage of the superior mixing with them constantly and unreservedly : he will know whom he should trust, and whom he should not. And no result is more happy, than when this feeling of mutual confidence can become widely prevalent between the two classes ; when the superiors can be as sure of a youth's conduct in their absence as in their presence ; and when the youth feels himself all the more bound to remember God's Presence, because the superior's eye is removed.

I must not conclude this part of the controversy, without mentioning one statement of " X. Y. Z.," to which I have already referred, and which certainly is of most opposite tendency to his other remarks. He says, " it must not be supposed that I would say a word to discountenance the friendly and familiar intercourse of masters and boys, grounded on a genuine feeling of sympathy on the one hand, and responded to by a trustful and affectionate respect on the other. Such intercourse I hold to be most eminently desirable." I maintain that this cannot be accepted as an explanation, for that it is a direct contradiction, of his original thesis. I maintain this on two grounds.

(1.) If there be " friendly and familiar intercourse of masters and boys," the former will be cognisant of most occasions on which the latter break the rules. Are they to exhibit indifference as to such transgression ? On the contrary, they will of course express disapprobation. And much more will they express disapprobation, when things are said or done which are intrinsically wrong, or when views are advocated at variance with Christian principle. Here, then, we have a body of superiors, constantly mixing with the students, and expressing disapprobation whenever rules are broken or wrong things said or done. If this be not surveillance, and of the strictest kind, I should like to know what is.

(2.) If this last statement of " X. Y. Z." be admitted as his view, his whole appeal to Protestant public schools becomes nugatory and absurd. The separation of masters from boys is no accident of that system ; it is the one fundamental idea, on which it is founded, and on which it is defended. Those who praise those institutions, do so invariably on the express ground of this separation. They urge that a boy acquires various sorts of " manly virtue," by the very fact of being thus brought into unrestrained contact with his companions. They boast that a Protestant youth is really educated for

his future position ; that he learns the invaluable art of pushing himself forward in the world, and holding his own, from the very fact that at school he is *obliged* to "hold his own," that he has practically no appeal to the masters, and must trust therefore for defence to his own "courage and spirit." To introduce the "familiar intercourse of masters and boys," would simply be to revolutionise the whole. I shall never forget, after my most dreary school reminiscences, how touched and delighted I was, by the relation between governors and governed which I found existing in a Catholic college. This statement of mine, on the essentialness of this separation to the very notion of a Protestant public school, I will corroborate by the strongest authority which can well be adduced on such a matter. These, then, are Dr. Stanley's remarks, in his Life of Dr. Arnold :

"In this constitution [of English public schools] there were peculiarities of far greater importance in his eyes, for good or evil, than any mere imaginative associations ;—the peculiarities *which distinguish the English public-school system from almost every other system of education in Europe, and which are all founded on the fact of so large a number of boys being left for so large a portion of their time to form an independent society of their own*, in which the influence that they exercise over each other is far greater than can possibly be exercised by the masters, even if multiplied beyond their present number.

"How *keenly he felt the evils resulting from this system, and the difficulty of communicating to it any real Christian character*, will be evident to any one who knows the twelfth Sermon in his second volume, in which he unfolded, at the beginning of his career, the causes which *had led good men to declare, that 'public schools are the seats and nurseries of vice ;'* or the three Sermons on 'Christian Schools,' in his fifth volume, in which, with the added experience of ten years, he analysed the six evils by which he supposed that great schools were likely to be corrupted, and to be changed from the likeness of God's people to that of a den of thieves.

"Sometimes he *would be led to doubt whether it were really compatible with the highest principles of education ;* sometimes he would seem to have an *earnest and almost impatient desire to free himself from it*. Still, on the whole, it was always on a reformation, not in an overthrow, of the existing constitution of the school, that he endeavoured to act. '*Another system,*' he said, '*may be better in itself ;* but I am placed in this system, and am bound to try what I can make of it.'"^{*}

* It will be observed in the text how very far from confident Dr. Arnold himself was, on the value of that system with which circumstances had connected him. Again, let the following passage be observed, written by Dr. Arnold himself: "I am a coward about schools, and yet I have not the satisfaction of being a coward *κατα προαιρεσιν* ; for I am inclined to think that the trials of a school are useful to a boy's after character, and thus I dread not to expose my boys to it ; while, on the other hand, the immediate effect of it is so ugly, that, like washing one's hands with earth, one shrinks

The only value, then, I think, of my opponent's statement on which I have just been commenting, is to show what singularly small attention he has given to the task, of thinking out his own views with any accuracy or consistency.

Having sufficiently considered the first of his proposals, I proceed to the second; viz. that far greater scope should be given to the affections.

I admit readily that the evil is very great indeed, if in any particular instance the great Objects of Faith—our Creator, our Redeemer, our Heavenly Mother, and the rest—are not so prominently exhibited, so efficaciously impressed, both on the intellect and the imagination, as to elicit deep devotional fervour. And if this task *were* any where neglected, a general impression might not unnaturally spring up, such as that to which my opponent refers, that "strong natural affections are a disqualification for the priesthood." But surely "X. Y. Z." will admit, that if this *be* the case in any seminary, it is a mere practical corruption requiring reform. No one will say that the principle of conduct, *avowed* any where, is the purposely abstaining from such an exhibition of Divine Truth, as may elicit the keenest emotions, and fully satisfy the most lively affections.

I observe, however, that both "F." and "A. B. C." ascribe here to "X. Y. Z." a totally different meaning; they consider that he refers to earthly objects of affection. His letter, on the whole, gives me the same impression, though it were to be wished he had made his meaning clearer; his argument, indeed, drawn from F. Newman's comment on St. Paul, can hardly have any other drift. I may assume, then, I suppose, that he is intending to speak against what is undoubtedly held as an essential principle in our colleges, the prohibition of what are called "particular friendships." On this narrow interpretation, however, of his meaning, nine-tenths of his arguments are totally irrelevant. He has laid his chief stress on the great importance of priests having warm and tender hearts. What on earth has this to do with "particular friendships"? Unless, indeed, my opponent will maintain the impious paradox (as I am sure he will not), that contemplative saints are cold-hearted beings, and that the Creator is no sufficient object for the affections which

from dirting them so grievously in the first stage of the process." "X. Y. Z." comments very justly on "the marked improvement in the character of the public schools," which "is mainly owing to the singular gifts and extraordinary influence of the late Dr. Arnold." Here is the theory of such schools, as stated by this eminent improver of them; their first effect is to be moral depravity. Is this, then, the model which it is desired that Catholic Bishops shall follow in the discipline of their colleges? Are they expected to reform these into a shape, in which the first effect on the neophyte shall be an initiation into vice? For Dr. Arnold himself, I have always entertained the warmest admiration and regard; but I am very confident that the system, into which he was accidentally thrown, is in itself so utterly rotten, that no efforts of a saint, much less even of a Dr. Arnold, could make it tolerable. *Delenda est Carthago.*

He has implanted. The only argument, therefore, which remains in the slightest degree available to him, is that which he derives from St. Paul's character, as commented on by F. Newman. 'St. Paul,' argues my opponent, 'is the type of a large class of holy men who have warm and eager human affections. Our existing mode of training clerical students, through the prohibition of particular friendships, must wholly fail in dealing with such men. Hence, either they must remain excluded from the priesthood, or our existing maxims must be revolutionised.'

My opponent's notion, then, would seem to be, that a character like St. Paul's would be deprived of all opportunity for free growth and development, through the prohibition of particular friendships. And yet this notion is so very preposterous, that I hesitate in ascribing it to him without very strict and unmistakable evidence. St. Paul and St. Timothy, I suppose, if they were fellow-students, would be always separating themselves from the rest, to enjoy each other's undisturbed society. Any third person, coming to join them, would feel from their manner that his presence is an intrusion. They would abound in little confidences and topics of interest, peculiar to themselves, and to which the others are not admitted. If circumstances prevent them from meeting, they are restless and dissatisfied. Such, that I may not descend to further trivialities, are the kind of phenomena contemplated in the prohibition of "particular friendships." And if St. Paul would have regarded these phenomena with simple disgust, I suppose he would have suffered no great restraint or repression of character from their prohibition.

On the other hand, our existing system affords both great scope and great encouragement to the healthy development of human affection; and specially to such development as will be most suitable for a priest. Suppose a student love to trace the various marks of grace in those around him, and from his very love for them gives up this or that gratification, which, though innocent in him, may be to them a scandal: here is a very Pauline development of human affection. Or suppose he feels specially drawn to one, of whom he sees that, under a rough and unattractive exterior, there lies hid a real and earnest desire of serving God. Suppose that, disregarding personal inconvenience, he labours assiduously at removing the difficulties and perplexities of such a youth, at protecting him from conversational oppression and bullying, at making others understand him, nay, at making the good youth understand himself. Once more: suppose our student is known to every one as ready to lend a most willing ear, and give most thoughtful and considerate advice, in any case of personal perplexity or distress. Lastly, suppose he is recognised by all as ever most ready to surrender his own gratification at the wish of others. Does my opponent suppose that, in such cases as these, our existing system would lead to the discouragement and repression of such dispositions? Any really good superior would undoubtedly visit them with the warmest approbation and sympathy.

It is quite certain, however, that "X.Y.Z." has totally failed to seize Father Newman's meaning, in his masterly analysis of St. Paul's character. Father Newman states distinctly that, whereas saints may be divided into the two classes which he describes, the vocation of one class is fully as high as that of the other. "X.Y.Z.," on the contrary, with equal distinctness, says the precise reverse. He says that the present method of discipline may be very good for "canonised saints," but not "for the common run of youths, who are very unlike them." Either he must admit that our existing seminary system is very fit to train a St. Paul or a St. Chrysostom,—and to say this is simply to sing a palinode of his whole theory,—or else he must maintain, that the future St. Paul belongs to the "common run of youths," and is very inferior in vocation to the future St. Aloysius and St. Stanislaus.

I conclude, then, that whereas "X.Y.Z.'s" first suggestion was in the highest degree unreasonable and mischievous, his second is more probably altogether unmeaning; but that if it have a meaning, if he really wishes the prohibition of "particular friendships" to be discontinued, the second proposal is almost as mischievous as the first. I pass on now to the third and last.

My opponent, then, had he the power, would throw the whole field of literature much more widely open to clerical students than is now done. And that his meaning may be more exactly understood, I will observe that the entire mass of non-religious books may be divided, for our present purpose, into three distinct classes.

The first class is very miscellaneous. In this class I include (1) the whole extent of mathematical and physical science; (2) works on the scientific structure of language; (3) all books of geography and travels, so far as the latter refer merely to places and not to men; (4) of chronology and historical annals, by which latter name I mean to express such historical works as treat merely on external events, and do not aim at any vivid illustration of human nature; (5) such poetry as is merely descriptive of natural scenery and beauty. All these books, widely differing in other respects, agree in presenting a broad contrast to those which I shall mention in the third class. And in regard to these books, without exception, there is no exclusiveness of principle at all in our seminaries; they are most freely and ungrudgingly admitted. I never heard of any objection to them, based on grounds of moral and religious discipline.

In the second class I place works on metaphysics and psychology, and still more works touching on religious questions, written by non-Catholics. The admission of these is no doubt greatly objected to, and I think most justly, until their contents have been carefully sifted and examined. But the grounds of this exclusion are so totally unconnected with the matters treated by "X.Y.Z.," that it would be irrelevant to pursue the matter further.

The third, then, and far the largest class remains, which may be

called by the special name of "literature." In this class are included all those books, which contain a picture of human nature as delineated by worldly men ;—all those books, in which the writers, consciously or unconsciously, exhibit individual or collective man as seen from a worldly point of view. If any books do not exhibit human nature at all, they fall under one or other of the two preceding classes. If they depict, whether in theory or in example, the various pursuits, aspirations, characters, of the mass of men, as estimated by the one true standard, they are religious books ; whether they take the shape of sermons and essays, or history, or didactic tales. But the class of books now in question depicts all this, not from the true, but from the false point of view. I am speaking, I repeat, of books, in which these things are described or exhibited, not with reprobation, as by the religionist ; but with sympathy and agreement, as by writers who are themselves imbued with the same worldly principles. These books describe or exhibit (to use my opponent's most forcible language) "the waywardness of intellect, the vehemence of passion, the feebleness of principle, the susceptibility of sin, in a word, all which savours of the old Adam in man." But they describe or exhibit all this, not as *being* miserable and sinful, nor with any reference (expressed or implied) to the Gospel standard ; but merely as an assemblage of *facts*, which go to make up the whole complex picture of human life.

There are some few books undoubtedly, of which it may be difficult to say, with certainty, in which of these classes they are properly placed, or which belong partly to one and partly to the other. But on the whole this division will be found, I think, most practical and intelligible.

I will call books of this last class by the special name "literature ;" and there is no question, that the introduction of this "literature" among the students is regarded with extreme suspicion in most Catholic seminaries. They may differ a good deal from each other, as to the particular books which are absolutely and peremptorily excluded ; but the whole class is viewed with aversion and distrust. "X. Y. Z." desires that the student should be encouraged, and even advised, to read such works ; I maintain, on the contrary, speaking broadly and generally, that the less he has to do with them the better. And on this point issue is now to be joined.

I am now, then, to consider the effect which would be produced on the personal character of our students, by such an innovation as my opponent proposes. In fairness, however, to him, your readers must remember, that this is by no means the chief ground on which he urges his recommendation ; he urges it rather as giving the future priest more means of influencing the educated world. This latter reason I am afterwards to treat, with the care which its importance deserves ; but I must first consider the question, which comes first in order, the effect on individual character.

"X. Y. Z.'s" own opinions are certainly extreme enough. "It is difficult," he says, "to see why . . . ecclesiastical students should

be left in ignorance, even were it possible, of the existence and romance of a passion, which *in boyhood is not likely to be seriously felt*, and which in manhood they will be called upon, not ignorantly, but deliberately, to abjure." Now this sentence contains two propositions so amazing, that I doubt if any thing the least like them was ever said by a Catholic before.

(1) My opponent thinks that the "romance" of earthly "passion" should be studied by boys, at an age when they are too young "seriously to feel" it. The importance is often inculcated of placing the great Objects of faith as clearly as possible before the youngest, in order that, as they grow up and their affections unfold, the Objects may be already familiar on which those affections may most suitably repose. "X. Y. Z." seems to think it only fair that God should not be alone in the field; that every possible facility and encouragement should be given on the other side also, in case the affections (as they grow to maturity) may thus tend to develop themselves in the lower instead of the higher direction.

(2) The second proposition implied in the above passage is this: 'No one can be said to abjure marriage "*deliberately*" who has not studied the "romance" of earthly "passion." Those high saints who have lived in total and childlike seclusion, nay, the Mother of God herself, did not choose virginity with such true "deliberation" as does a youth who has given himself freely to the contemplation of love-scenes, in novels and other secular literature.' What is to be said of such a thinker as this, when he comes forward to instruct the body of Catholic Bishops in the true mode of training priests?

Apart, however, from all criticism on the writer, let me meet his suggestions on their own ground. First, I will consider one part of the subject, which is small indeed in extent, but paramount in importance; and afterwards I will enter on the more general question.

First, then, how far is it reasonable to expect, that youths destined for celibacy shall be encouraged to study the "romance" of earthly "passion" without most serious danger to their purity? I am not at all meaning that every novel is included in this question, merely because its hero and heroine marry at the end. There are some novels, I suppose, which might without harm be permitted at certain exceptional periods, as *e. g.* during vacation time; and the evils of which, if they were permitted at *all* times, would be altogether different from those which we are now considering. I am taking "X. Y. Z.'s" statement as it stands, viz.: that the "romance" of earthly "passion" may be put before students without serious danger to their purity. Now "F." has expressed himself on this head most beautifully and persuasively; and I must say that "X. Y. Z." has made no attempt at all to meet his arguments. Following, therefore, in "F.'s" steps, I will thus argue.

The happiness to be enjoyed by the gratification of earthly passion, is a far more congenial thought to the natural man, than the thought of joys which are in truth far greater,—the joy of a tranquil and interior spirit, or the future bliss of heaven. It is this very

evil, against which it is desired to protect our youths, in training them to habits of careful and regular meditation. By pondering on the great prize which is offered to us hereafter, we more and more learn to *feel* its attractiveness; earthly pleasures become more insignificant to us, heavenly more important. To study the romance of passion, then, is precisely so far to undo all that meditation does; it restores earthly objects to that preëminence, which our fallen nature is only too ready to concede them. The *least* evil which would follow from this, in the case of ecclesiastical students, would be, that they should give up their vocation altogether; that they should seek the innocent enjoyment of that happiness, which has been so vividly depicted. In other words, the least evil which would follow from this way of bringing up ecclesiastical students would be, that there should remain no ecclesiastical students to *be* brought up at all.

But suppose a poor youth to retain his intention of seeking ordination, what then ensues? Instead of earnestly enforcing on him the unrivalled character of that happiness, which as a Christian he may most surely enjoy both here and hereafter, you do the very reverse; you do every thing in your power that he may form the most glowing picture (I may add also the most wildly delusive) of a happiness which can never innocently be his. The very temptation to indulge in such pictures, as "F." most truly says, "has to be resisted by him like temptation to sin;" and you do all in your power to make the temptation *irresistible*. Plainly, the reading most attractive delineations of earthly love tends most powerfully, in many cases quite unrestrainably, towards our delighting to feed our imagination, again and again, with every detail of the picture which we have received. I cannot imagine any one denying this, who has the least knowledge of human nature. And the evil is precisely greatest in those, who have the greatest capability of loving God, and whom "X. Y. Z." is so commendably anxious not to repel from the priesthood; I mean, youths of keen and lively feelings.

But what kind of probability is there, that with the great mass of students the evil will stop here? Earthly passion has its very characteristic, in the circumstance of its tending ultimately to that, which in the unmarried is among the foulest of sins; this is the very particular, wherein it differs from other human affections. I am very far indeed from meaning, that thoughts of this kind are ordinarily in the mind of persons "in love;" but I say that the feeling, which these persons experience, does in reality tend to what I have mentioned. Now, even under most favourable circumstances, even when the mind is assiduously trained in the highest direction, the preservation of purity in youths is among the most arduous and anxious of tasks. A constant and lifelong conflict against even the approaches of evil, is the main lesson earnestly enforced on their conscience. But what will be the effect, if they are permitted, nay encouraged, to imbue their imagination with attractive pictures of a passion, which tends in its own nature to that very indulgence, against which they are to be thus sedulously guarded? As to the frightful

results which must follow, if those who are to be priests fall into the unspeakable misery of a polluted imagination,—on this, in addressing Catholics, it would be impertinent to enlarge.

All this would hold, even on the hypothesis that it is really possible to make a distinction of such books; that it is possible to admit those which treat on the romance of passion, and yet exclude those which are directly suggestive of evil thoughts. But it is quite a delusion, I am confident, to suppose that any such distinction can really be carried out. My opponent, indeed, thinks that “the line of demarcation is not usually difficult to draw;” and proceeds to say that “nobody *e. g.* would put *Don Juan* into the hands of boys.” But it is not an openly and confessedly flagitious book like *Don Juan*, which is dangerous *in the beginning*; an innocent mind would recoil in disgust from so truly bestial a production. It is where pictures of sensuality are seen in close connection with pictures of human affection, where the two are presented as it were in one united exhibition, that the first process of corruption will take place.

Now, curiously enough, the very Number of your periodical which contains “X. Y. Z.’s” second letter, affords here a most apposite illustration. There is a “communicated article” which ends with the following sentence: “If any one” who reads but one novel a year “should cast an eye on these pages, I would strongly recommend him to let that one be a novel of George Eliot’s.” It so happens, accidentally, that I have not read *Adam Bede*; but a priest, a friend of mine, the last man whom any one would suspect of “retrogressive ideas,” and a considerable novel-reader, spoke to me with extreme reprobation of that work; he said that it was one of the most impure books he had ever seen, and that he had thrown it down in disgust. Now, let me suppose that the *Rambler* critic were a superior in some college, and that my priestly friend had been at the same time a student there. The former would actually have recommended a work, which to the latter would have been directly suggestive of evil thoughts.

What, then, are the advantages, for the sake of which “X. Y. Z.” would expose our youths to perils so appalling? The chief is, that such books will be inevitably met with in the priest’s future career, and that he will be better prepared for the trial by having seen them at college. This alleged advantage, however, applies not merely to the books in question, but to the whole body of ‘literature.’ I will treat it, therefore, somewhat later; and I hope to show in due course, that the probability of a priest meeting with such works is not merely not an argument in my opponent’s favour, but affords one of the strongest grounds against him.

The only other reason which I can discover for his suggestion is, that if such books are prohibited, boys will be sure to introduce them surreptitiously, and to read them also when away from college for the vacation. “I cannot doubt,” he says, “that such rules would be, *as in fact they always are*, evaded in numberless cases, and

grudgingly obeyed in the rest." I should like to know his grounds for so strange an assertion. I have already mentioned his recognition of that "zeal and devotion" in the French clergy "of which it would be impossible to speak too highly." Were these admirable men, when young, in the habit of studying on the sly love-scenes from novels? or was their obedience to the rule of exclusion a "grudging" obedience? I should much like to know what means "X. Y. Z." possesses of knowing the facts he thus confidently states. He speaks with vehemence against the "Continental system;" I should like to know how much attention he has given to the facts of that system. He seems to think it impossible, that the moral feeling of a Catholic college can rise to any higher elevation, than that which exists in those wretched Protestant institutions, which he is bent on holding up to our admiration. Evidently he has not the slightest idea what the moral condition of a seminary can become, when carefully-chosen superiors are in habits of constant and affectionate intercourse with those committed to their charge.

I would here briefly add, that there is another ground, altogether subordinate to the former and immeasurably less momentous, why the reading of novels is very undesirable, unless in some very exceptional period. And here I speak inclusively of novels which do *not* exhibit the romance of passion, but which contain the gradual development of some highly-interesting story. The great excitement of their perusal unstrings the nerves, and greatly indisposes to the tranquil and regular performance of every-day duties. I can quote in my favour here a corroboration which is more likely (it would seem) to weigh with "X. Y. Z." than the united judgment of all Catholic authorities throughout the world. At the Protestant public school where I was educated, novels were strictly forbidden; and I believe that this prohibition was pretty stringently enforced.

I now come to the broader question. How far is it desirable, as far as the question of character is concerned, that encouragement should be given to the study of "literature," in that special sense which I have given to the word? "X. Y. Z." wishes, as I understand him, that books of this class should be placed in some library, and that to this library unlimited access should be permitted in recreation-time. I maintain against him, that evils of the greatest magnitude may very probably follow from any such arrangement, and that no good result of any kind to the individual character could ensue. Nor can I better introduce what I would say on this matter, than by the following most powerful passage of F. Newman's. I would only observe, as will be evident on reading it, that he uses the term "literature" in a somewhat wider sense than that special one which I have assigned to it.

"Literature," says the illustrious writer, "stands related to man as science stands to nature; it is his history. Man is composed of body and soul; he thinks and he acts; he has appetites, passions, affections, motives, designs; he has within him the lifelong struggle of duty with inclination; he has an intellect fertile and capacious;

he is formed for society, and society multiplies and diversifies in endless combinations his personal characteristics, moral and intellectual. All this constitutes his life ; of all this literature is the expression ; so that literature is in some sort to him what autobiography is to the individual : it is his life and remains. Moreover, he is this sentient, intelligent, creative, and operative being, quite independent of any extraordinary aid from Heaven, or any definite religious belief ; and *as such*, as he is in himself, does literature represent him ; it is the life and remains of the *natural* man, or man in *purâ naturâ*. I do not mean to say that it is impossible in its very notion that literature should be tinged by a religious spirit ; Hebrew literature, as far as it can be called literature, certainly is simply theological, and has a character imprinted on it which is above nature ; but I am speaking of what is to be expected without any extraordinary dispensation ; and I say that, in matter of fact, as science is the reflection of nature, so is literature also—the one of nature physical, the other of nature moral and social. Circumstances—such as locality, period, language—seem to make little or no difference in the character of literature as such ; on the whole, *all literatures are one ; they are the voices of the natural man*.

“ I wish this were all that had to be said to the disadvantage of literature ; but while nature physical remains fixed in its own laws, nature moral and social has a will of its own, is self-governed, and never remains any long while in that state from which it started into action. Man will never continue in a mere state of innocence ; he is sure to sin, and his literature will be the expression of his sin ; and this whether he be heathen or Christian. Christianity has thrown gleams of light on him and his literature ; but, *as it has not converted him, but only certain choice specimens of him*, so it has not changed the characters of his mind or his history ; his literature is *either what it was, or worse than what it was*, in proportion as there has been an abuse of knowledge granted and a rejection of truth. On the whole, then, I think it will be ever found, as a matter of course, that literature, as such, no matter of what nation, is the science or history, *partly and at best of the natural man, partly of man fallen*.”

This account of literature is the more remarkable, because the tendency of F. Newman's argument is very different from that of mine, though not inconsistent with it. For it is his very purpose, in the lecture from which this passage has been extracted, to urge the absolute necessity, which in his opinion exists, of our gentry being familiarised with the general study of literature. He is giving, therefore, this most repulsive picture, of that very commodity which he is recommending ;—recommending, however, it would seem, rather as the least of two alternative evils than as in itself desirable.* And

* At least the only argument which I can see there for the importance of the study is this : “ we cannot *possibly keep them* from plunging into the world, with all its ways, principles, and maxims, when their time comes ; but we can *prepare* them against what is *inevitable*,” &c.

that he has not in the least over-stated the evil, will be evident from the following considerations.

'Literature,' in that special sense which I have given to the term, expresses, as your readers may remember, those books in which worldly men delineate the world. Such principles, therefore, as the following, are implied as a matter of course in every one of such works.

(1) 'For a man to make the main end of his life to consist in labouring to promote his own interior perfection and growth in God's love,—this is the sure mark of a mean and contemptible spirit. Such feeble-minded individuals should resort to monasteries, being fit for nothing better.

(2) 'Those who are worthy of our honour as high-minded and spirited men, have two main motives ever before their mind; a sensitive regard to their honour, and a keen sense of their personal dignity.' Or, to express the same thing more truly, 'are actuated by vain-glory and pride in the most intense degree.

(3) 'As their springs of action are worldly, so also their spheres of action. Some great temporal end—the exaltation of our country's temporal greatness or the achievement of her liberty,—here is a pursuit well worthy of man's high aspirations. He who should regard immorality and worldliness as immeasurably greater evils to his country than political weakness and subjection, is a poltroon; unworthy the name of patriot, or even of man.

(4) 'Physical courage is a far greater virtue than meekness, humility, or forgivingness.

(5) 'Intellectual power and resource is in itself worthy of reverence, quite apart from the question whether it be used for God or against Him.

(6) 'Impurity is no very serious evil, where it is not accompanied by fraud or dishonour; and should in no way be permitted to lessen our respect for one, who has pursued large temporal ends with spirit, adroitness, and sincerity. On the other hand, that narrow monastic spirit, whereby such hard things are said of the failing in question,—this spirit is much more morally detestable than is that which it censures.

(7) 'Of all modes of life, the most simply absurd is that, wherein a man or body of men separate from the world, that they may the more uninterruptedly contemplate their Creator. This is pure laziness, and well deserves every kind of bitter ridicule or serious attack.'

Such principles as these are in direct opposition to truths, which the Church has testified in every age with the greatest stress and prominence. And it is something like a truism to say, that the more eagerly such books are read, so much the deeper root will these anti-Christian principles take in the mind. There are two obvious reasons why this should especially be the case. First, secular literature is generally clothed in a far more attractive external dress than religious. Secondly, and much more importantly, worldly objects

have by nature immeasurably more influence on the human heart ; and it is therefore certain that the eager and sympathetic study of 'literature' will do far worse than merely neutralise the effects of meditation and spiritual reading.

But there is another consideration which should not be omitted. The allowing my son to enter on the indiscriminate reading of 'literature,' is only parallel with the allowing him to enter into indiscriminate society. Now, suppose I had to choose between these two alternative evils. Suppose I were obliged, either to send my son into some society where the doctrines of Christianity are openly and avowedly attacked ; or else into one, in which they are not formally mentioned, but in which every thing, said and implied on the various topics of conversation, goes upon a view of things utterly anti-Christian. If we further suppose that in neither of these cases indecency and scurrility of language finds entrance, every one (I think) would rather allow his son to be in the former than in the latter. In the former, the open avowal of disbelief puts him on his guard, and throws him into a combative attitude ; he regards, therefore, their words with distrust and dislike. Again, he may report the propositions which he has heard to Christian advisers, and learn the true answer to such propositions. But in the latter, he imbibes he knows not what ; maxims find access to his convictions, which, had they been nakedly expressed, would have disgusted and revolted him ; he becomes a semi-infidel, before he even suspects the process through which he has been passing.

Now the case of 'literature' is altogether analogous to this latter class of company. The above principles are not categorically and formally stated, like the axioms in Euclid ; though, indeed, even in Euclid, it is remarkable how many axioms are assumed which have *not* been stated. But the principles above enumerated, and many others altogether similar, are assumed to be true, quite undeniably and as a matter of course ;—so undeniably, that the explicit statement of them would be an impertinence. Thus youths, who might have been put on their guard by openly heathenish propositions, are caught as it were by craft, and imbibe anti-Christian poison without suspecting its real nature. And the natural result of all this would be, that our ecclesiastical students would go forth into the world, with views far more resembling those of literary heathens than of Christian priests.

This, I must take leave to say, is (in my judgment) the most serious evil of "X. Y. Z.'s" letters. If he had taken the pains to go to the bottom of his thoughts, and seize the principles which are implied throughout his argument, I am confident that he would have been the first to recoil in horror and disgust. I suppose he is a great reader of 'literature' himself, as he so strongly recommends it ; and if so, he will give the best possible illustration of my argument. He has unconsciously imbibed, to a great extent, the world's detestable maxims ; and he argues from them, by a process as unconscious as that by which he received them.

Let us now see how matters would stand *on the whole*, if my opponent's various recommendations were adopted. Every one who has had any concern with religious education knows very well where lies the chief difficulty. The taught are generally most ready to accept and take for granted the doctrines and principles which their teachers inculcate. What they are very slow to do, is to understand the meaning of these doctrines and principles, as translated into the language of every-day life ; to see what course of action or thought is implied in these principles, under the various circumstances in which they are placed through the day ; to apprehend what is the judgment which those principles logically require them to form, on the various facts which surround them and come before their cognisance. And this being so, no religious teachers are content with laying before the mind certain great truths in chapel or at catechism. They are most anxious that these lessons shall be practically brought home to the youthful mind, in their full concrete force and application, by the various influences of familiar conversation and practical example. Unless this be done, abstract and theoretical religious instruction is hardly more than a mockery and a sham.

Now let me make an impossible supposition. Let me suppose that some Catholic Bishop should be induced to carry out in his seminary the recommendations of "X. Y. Z." The lessons theoretically taught, in chapel or catechism, will remain (I grant) the same as now. But what single steps could be taken towards practically enforcing these lessons, and bringing them home to the conscience as living and authoritative rules of action ? The time not spent in chapel, or again in bed, is either study-time or recreation-time ; these, therefore, are the two opportunities at a superior's disposal, for practically imbuing the mind with religious principles. Study-time, according to "X. Y. Z.," is mainly to be spent in studying eagerly the classical writers, and endeavouring as far as possible to seize and sympathise with their whole spirit. Well, whatever may be the value of this as an intellectual discipline (which we are not here discussing), one thing at least is certain. Heathen writers, from the very force of terms, were men who were abject and degraded slaves to this visible scene : to sympathise, therefore, with the spirit of their writings, cannot possibly be a road towards practically realising that great invisible world, which the student is desired to make the one centre of his thoughts, the one measure of all earthly things. It is not in study-time, according to my opponent's plan, that any thing can be done, towards the practical and persuasive instilment of spirituality.

Recreation-time, then, alone remains, for this all-important purpose ; but here again "X. Y. Z." has succeeded in interposing an absolutely insurmountable barrier between the youth and all religious influences. In recreation-time they are to be left by themselves ; lest they should become "sneaks," and in order that they may cultivate the "manly virtues" through unrestrained mutual intercourse. And lest human nature by itself should not be suffi-

ciently prolific in worldly and unchristian principles, the whole field of 'literature' is opened to their view, and they are even encouraged to throw themselves without guidance or restraint on its eager perusal. It is not merely, then, that religious instruction is entirely confined to those formal lessons which are delivered in chapel or at catechism. This would be very bad; but "X. Y. Z.'s" system is far worse. It is not merely that religious instruction is to be unsupported at other times, it is to be most actively thwarted and counteracted. The main course of study, and all the intellectual part of recreation, is to be spent on writers, whose whole course of thought is directly opposed to Gospel morality.

My opponent argues, that, when a priest goes forth into the world, he will not be able to ignore 'literature;' but that, on the contrary, it will be pressed clamorously on his notice, by every different access, and in every variety of shape. I agree with him, that this is a momentous fact in our present circumstances: the enormously-increased number who have the means of reading books, and, as a consequence, the enormously-increased extent and influence of 'literature.' It seems to me, I confess, very desirable, that this whole subject should be systematically treated in our colleges; that the students should be expressly instructed how to take a correct view, and make a proper use, of this vast assemblage of worldly books. It would be well, I venture to think, if some popular specimen of such works were made the theme of a course of lectures; the attendants at which course should be taught to see explicitly what are the principles really implied in this or that passage, and how fundamentally opposed are those principles to the very foundations of Christian morality. Such a lecturer would further caution his hearers, against allowing any admiration for genius or wit to conceal from them the real nature of such aberrations. He would enforce on them the great truth, that the possession of high intellectual gifts can only increase the guilt of those, who use them against the Giver. He would remind them, that an immense number of these writers have now passed from this world, and appeared before their Judge. And further, that in all these men there exists at this moment one strong desire; viz. that they might rather have been the dumbest and stupidest of rational creatures, than have gone through the degradation of using those talents which God gave them, in giving increased attractiveness and recommendation to that world which is His chief enemy.

But if circumstances render it impossible to give such a methodical criticism of 'literature,' then a wise superior will be anxious to keep from the students, as long as possible, those writings which might have so mischievous an influence. He will be desirous that, before they are exposed to the danger, they shall be fully provided with arms to encounter it; and will all the more labour to train them carefully and profoundly in theological and ascetical principles. To say with my opponent that, *because* the priest will meet such books in the world, *therefore* he should be allowed to

read them at college without careful guidance and warning, this is a statement so extravagant, that he cannot, on consideration, adhere to it. It is as though he said, 'They will hereafter be exposed to the danger of imbibing deadly poison; and it is therefore most important to provide them with an antidote. But since there is no antidote immediately available, let us do what is second best, viz. put before them the poison at once.'

And this leads me to the last question which may be asked on this matter; viz. What is the legitimate use which may be made of 'literature,' by the various classes of Christian men? I can only attempt here to answer this question, in the case of those whom the present controversy concerns; viz. clerical students at our diocesan seminaries.

For these, so far as their individual character is concerned (not yet considering the farther question of their influence on others), I think that the only advisable use of literature is simple recreation. Innocent recreation is really an end of far more prominent importance, than might at first sight be supposed; and perhaps we English require more hearty and thorough relaxation of mind than do foreigners. In this respect the active out-door games, so emphatically promoted in our colleges, are of invaluable service. Music, again, and other similar accomplishments, are greatly conducive to the same purpose. Many colleges possess chemical apparatus, or similar appliances, which, in addition to their graver uses, may be made very serviceable in this respect. All those kinds of secular books, again, which I enumerated in the first class, may be (and ordinarily are) drawn on most unreservedly for amusement. But in addition to all this, that class of books which we have been chiefly discussing has an important place of its own. Recreation is more hearty and refreshing, in proportion as the current of ideas is more violently changed, and thrown on a different class of objects from those which occupy severer hours. Many selections might be made from 'literature,' if great care is exercised, in which anti-Christian principles are not exhibited in any dangerously influential shape, while, at the same time, there is much of touching pathos; or, again, where grotesque and humorous scenes of various kinds occur. Even where the entire book could not safely be left in the library, most interesting and amusing selections might be publicly read; and if set off with first-rate reading, would be found a most recreative amusement. Even in the lightest moments, however, it is always well from time to time to turn ridicule into its legitimate channel; and to exhibit in various shapes the grotesque absurdity implied in the fact, that men, who sincerely believe in God and a future state, can gravely devote themselves to this world, as the main end and interest of their lives.

It now remains, under this head, to consider what advantages "X.Y.Z." himself proposes, by throwing open 'literature' in its whole extent. By far the chief stress, however, as I have already observed, is laid by him on its value as conducive to the priest's

future influence over the laity ; and that question I am to consider in a later part of this letter. The only statement which I can find, bearing on its benefit to the personal character, is contained in the following passage from his first letter. He is saying that he fully admits "the immense importance of purity ; but," he adds, "I should like to ascertain whether the same result could not be obtained by other means ; and whether the end is really secured which alone could compensate for *the almost inevitable consequences of depressed imagination and stunted intellectual development*. . . . It is surely the general rule, that precisely those whose intellect is least exercised, and whose imagination is most sluggish, are *the readiest and most helpless slaves of the merely animal passions*. Nor should it be forgotten that the more rigidly you narrow the limits of general information and thought, the more will the mental faculties be dwarfed, and the more exclusively will attention be concentrated, with a morbid and microscopic pertinacity, on petty criticisms of personal and domestic details."

I found this passage at first quite bewildering. But on a second perusal I could not help seeing that it contains the following proposition ; a proposition which at first I had not thought it possible that any man in his senses could have intended. He is speaking of the restrictions on reading "usually imposed in Catholic colleges." Now, no one will maintain that any books are excluded which belong to the first of the three classes that I originally specified ; the exclusion which my opponent laments is the exclusion of those which contain a delineation of the world by worldly men. "X.Y.Z.," beyond question, then, asserts, that unless we study such works, "our attention will be morbidly concentrated on petty personal criticisms ;" and we shall moreover probably be the "ready and helpless slaves of the merely animal passions." If we ask him why this result must ensue, he answers thus : because our "imagination" will be "depressed," our "intellectual development" "stunted," our "mental faculties" "dwarfed." These truly amazing allegations I am now to consider.

And first, as to those secular books which no one ever dreamt of excluding. Surely there is incredible recklessness in the statement, that the whole field of mathematical and physical science affords no genuine cultivation to the "intellect," and that there is no appeal to the "imagination" in all that touching and charming poetry which treats of natural beauty. Is he not indeed rather behind the age in this statement ? Is not Wordsworth's poetry, *e. g.*, mainly such ? and is it not a growing opinion that he is among the greatest of poets ? I speak here entirely at secondhand ; but I have understood from many good judges, that an affirmative answer should be given to both these questions.

But how truly wonderful to hear it stated, that a priest's professional studies, even were he confined to these, afford no scope to "intellect" and "imagination" ! Nay, "X.Y.Z." seems to think of God and the whole invisible world as non-existent. If you debar

the students from *general information*, he says, they will have *nothing to think about* except "petty criticisms of personal and domestic details." All the marvels of natural and revealed religion, the sacred words of God Incarnate, the inspired utterances of that St. Paul whom elsewhere "X. Y. Z." seems duly to revere, the divine poetry of the Psalms, the attractive union of piety, rhetoric, and logic presented, *e. g.*, by St. Augustine's writings,—all this and indefinitely more is regarded by my opponent as simply nothing at all. If we have nothing better than this to think about, such is his statement, we shall be driven, from pure want of matter for thought, to concentrate our attention with morbid and microscopic pertinacity on "petty domestic details;" or, still worse, we shall be helpless "slaves to the lowest animal passions." It is to "Shakespeare and Scott" we are to look as our preservers from impure imaginations; for such imaginations must inevitably befall us, if we confine our studies to the divine and spiritual order.

As to the question of *intellectual* power, this is more suitably to be considered in the last part of this letter; for it has much more to do with a priest's *influence* than with his interior character. Here, therefore, I will but briefly say, that such an exercitation of the mind as the theory of our seminaries supposes, if efficiently carried out, is excellently adapted for promoting intellectual strength. An intellect trained, first by mathematics and the study of language; then by logic, metaphysics, and psychology; lastly, by a theology built on these;—will assuredly hold its own against any rival with which it can ordinarily be brought into contact.

But the due culture of the *imagination* is really most important, even in its bearing on the individual. It is often only by means of the imagination, that the great truths of religion obtain access to the heart; and the imagination will always be of inestimable service, in obtaining for them a far readier access, and far deeper apprehension. Both my opponent and myself, therefore, are very desirous that the imagination shall be duly fostered and developed. He considers, however, that it will always be "sluggish" unless the field of "literature" be extended before its gaze. For myself, on the contrary, I maintain this: if we wish the imagination to seize on those great truths which are its highest and its intended food, the one hopeful way is, that those truths shall be assiduously placed before the mind in their most attractive and soul-subduing shape. Let me say it again. Here is the question to be discussed: By what culture will our students most probably be led to grasp religious truth with their imagination? My opponent says, by reading "Shakespeare and Scott;" I say, by studying, *e. g.*, the lives and revelations of the more mystical and contemplative saints. He says, by first feeding their imagination on those objects which please the natural man—national greatness and worldly renown; I say, by feeding it from the first on its highest and most appropriate food—on those thrilling marvels which the Gospel has revealed.

Now, I ask, (1) which of these two alternatives is favoured by

common sense? Shall we best train a given faculty to act in a given direction, by exercising it in that, or in a totally different direction? I ask, (2) which of these two alternatives is recommended by Scripture and Theology? Is it by "living" to this visible world, or by "dying" to it, that we shall most live to the invisible? Is it by looking on earthly objects or heavenly that we are taught to aim at the grasp of religious truth? I ask, (3) which of these two alternatives is supported by fact? Who are those favoured individuals whose imagination has ever been most saturated with heavenly marvels? Are they the classical students, and the keen appreciators of "Shakespeare and Scott"? Or have they not rather been a very different class? I mean those mystical and contemplative saints, of whom I just now spoke, and who ordinarily, from their infancy upwards, have loved to exclude all thoughts, except those most directly connected with Him whom they so tenderly loved.

In concluding this first part of my letter, I wish I could understand how far "X.Y.Z." wishes his proposals to be universally adopted. His words, taken as they stand, land us in a most extraordinary conclusion.

Firstly, if we take the import of his statements, he wishes that the decided majority of priests should come from the class of gentry. For he tells us, that his suggestions "have reference mainly to students of a higher class; it was for them," he adds, "I expressed my belief, that a very different system from St. Sulpice would be found profitable." But then he presently adds another statement. "I would very strongly deprecate" the continental system "being made *the general rule*." He has not denied, then, that the continental system might be more suitable for students below the rank of gentry; yet he deprecates its being the general rule. The only inference which we can draw from these combined propositions is, that if he had his desire, the decided majority of priests should be taken from the class of gentry. Something of a novelty this!

But it is to a further proposition that I would draw particular attention. He says in his first letter, "I am far from saying that there would not be room for a St. Sulpice in England." And in his second letter he repeats this opinion: "I am far from denying that there is room even now in England for such a college as 'F.' desires; still less, that there would be, if our numbers were considerably augmented." Yet his argument, throughout the two letters, has been, that this continental system "dwarfs the mental faculties," "tends to deaden the sense of responsibility," makes persons "ready and helpless slaves of the merely animal passions," "is absolutely and fatally injurious to the character." According to "X.Y.Z.," then, if God *did* think fit to favour with an ecclesiastical vocation those below the class of gentry, it would be suitable enough for such as *them* to be placed under a system of education, which shall dwarf their mental faculties, deaden their sense of responsibility, render

them helpless slaves of the merely animal passions, and be absolutely and fatally injurious to their character. All this is surely more like insane raving than mere ordinary recklessness.

It may be said, perhaps, that he did not *mean* to draw this marked distinction between the upper and lower classes ; and that, although it be deducible from his words, yet this fact is entirely owing to his habitual inaccuracy of thought. This is probably true. Yet, at least, he *does* say, in so many words, that "there is room even now in England," and that there will probably be still more, for an educational system, which he has, nevertheless, described as so frightfully disastrous on all who may be brought under its control.

Here, then, at length I bring to a close the first part of my letter ; and the second will be far more briefly despatched, for the following reason. My opponent, as I have said, puts forth three principal suggestions : (1) that our clerical students shall be much less under surveillance than they are now ; (2) that they shall have much greater scope for human affections ; (3) that they shall have much readier access to 'literature.' He considers that if these suggestions were adopted, our priests' personal character, and also their general influence, would be greatly improved. But in regard to the first two of his three suggestions, he would admit that the *latter* result could only be obtained by means of the *former*. If I have succeeded, therefore, in establishing, that his first two suggestions would be grievously detrimental to a student's *character*, "X. Y. Z." will at once admit that they would be equally detrimental to the priest's future *influence*. But in regard to the third proposal, the case is different. My opponent will, no doubt, hold, that a study of 'literature' would be eminently desirable, even though it did *not* benefit the individual character, by importantly extending sacerdotal influence. This, then, is the last proposition which I am to combat.

I have no doubt that "X. Y. Z.'s" meaning on this head may be fairly expressed as follows : 'It is in the highest degree desirable that the education of our gentry should be greatly changed, and brought into far greater conformity with the Protestant system. If this be so, it will be necessary that our clerical education should also be changed, in order that the priests may have due influence over the gentry. Again, such a change will confer another great service, in enabling priests to cope with Protestants, and influence the general current of English thought.'

This statement takes for granted, that it *would* be beneficial if our gentry were educated more on the Protestant model. Now, however deep is my reverence for this or that individual who may seem to advocate this proposition, I, for one, have never been able to accept it. Still this is far too wide and serious a matter to be discussed episodically ; and I will therefore, for argument's sake, concede what "X. Y. Z." wishes on this head. With the other part of his assumption I thoroughly coincide. I heartily agree with him, wher-

ever he argues on the great desirableness that Catholic views and principles should be brought far more efficiently into contact with the general current of thought than is now the case. In order, therefore, to simplify the question, I will make to my opponent every preliminary concession he can possibly require. I will suppose that the Catholic gentry are at this moment educated on a system essentially similar to that of the English universities ; and that we are considering how the clergy may be most suitably trained in consequence.

Again, to make quite clear my point of divergence from "X. Y. Z.," I will add this further expression of opinion. I think it is very desirable, for various reasons, that a certain select number of priests should be duly prepared, to cope with the great questions of the day ; to help in fixing our controversial position ; and to influence the most highly educated, whether of Catholics or Protestants. Such priests must, of course, have gone through the best attainable discipline of their mental faculties ; they must be complete and accomplished theologians in the fullest sense of that word ; and they must, in addition, be very sufficiently conversant with history and literature, both ancient and modern. This statement alone suffices to show the absurdity of imagining that our seminaries can prepare such a priest ; since it is plain that his education must extend to a period very far later, than that when students in general receive ordination.

It is not, indeed, surprising, that facts of the present day should have led various thinkers in different parts of Christendom to consider anxiously the question, how Catholicism may exercise greater influence on the intellectual arena. But I think that, of all the plans which can imaginably be proposed, "X. Y. Z.'s" is very far the worst. By a curious infelicity, as it appears to me, he has hit upon a scheme, which unites the disadvantages of all with the advantages of none. This allegation I now proceed to support.

I hope presently to show, that priests educated according to my opponent's scheme would have less (not more) influence with educated laymen, than any other priests whatever. But I will first, for argument's sake, suppose the contrary. Still, this fact would be very far from sufficing for his conclusion : because it is far more important that they should influence the poor than the rich ; and "X. Y. Z.'s" scheme would, at all events, greatly unfit and indispose them for work among the poor. Let me state my meaning more fully.

It is far more important that the great body of priests should be fitted to deal with the poor than with the rich. For, firstly, a poor man's soul has the same value as a rich man's, and the poor are immensely more numerous. It may be said, indeed, that the social weight of the upper classes being so considerable, a much greater service is rendered by christianising a given number of them, than by christianising the same number of the poor. But, after allowing the fullest possible weight to this objection, it will

not materially affect our conclusion ; the disproportion being so enormous between the numbers of the two classes. Then consider farther the following fact : the educated, from the very fact of being educated, by no means depend for their religious knowledge on the priest who happens to be nearest. They are accessible, *e.g.*, by means of books ; and a very small number of specially-prepared priests would amply suffice to do all that is necessary, for protecting them against speculative difficulties, and drawing them towards God. On the other hand, the poor are absolutely dependent on the priest under whom they are placed, as to the efficacy with which the great Objects of faith are impressed on their mind, and with which religious truth is brought home to their conscience.

To act, then, on the hearts and consciences of the poor, must ever remain the principal work of an ordinary priest. Now let it be considered how greatly the carrying of "X. Y. Z.'s" recommendations would incapacitate or disincline him for such work. It would do so in two different ways.

First, his life is to be one of constant persevering intercourse with those who are poorest and most unrefined ; exhausting, thankless, unrequited toil is to be his normal occupation. He who is to be supported through such a life as this, should be emphatically what is called a "man of one idea." His whole mind should be pervaded by this one thought—the utter worthlessness of all else in comparison with the soul, the paramount importance of religious truth. There is no one mental peculiarity which would more indispose any of us to such a career as this, than what are called "literary habits ;" the habit of leading a quiet sedentary life, and feeding the taste and imagination on secular writings. A certain, not inconsiderable, amount of intellectual and theological education is no doubt required, in order to the due discharge of his indispensable duties. For he must possess a full and familiar grasp of Christian doctrine ; he must have the power of imparting that doctrine under every variety of circumstance, and in every variety of shape ; he must be competent to cope with the various difficult cases which may occur in the confessional ; and possess various other intellectual qualifications not necessary to enumerate. Yet even in these indispensable theological studies, good superiors are always very anxious lest he imbibe any distaste for active and practical work ; and are careful in providing remedies, which may guard against so serious a danger. But so far as he has learned to be studious *without* being theological, so far as he has learned to make an occupation of secular literature, the evil in our present point of view is unmixed.

A second way in which literary habits must lessen a priest's hold on the poor, is in lessening his sympathy with them, and his keen appreciation of their circumstances and character. If his interests be wholly in his professional studies, in proportion as his flock become more pious and spiritual, he is the more closely joined to them in heart and affection. But literary tastes go to constitute a permanent barrier between him and them.

I cannot better express what I am here urging, than in the words of one whose name (if I might mention it) would carry the greatest weight on such a matter. "The uneducated among the laity," he says, "being the many, and the refined, large-minded, and accomplished being the few, the notion is preposterous that the *clerus universus* should be trained on the model of the few, and not so as best to meet the capacities and characteristics of the many."

It is truly wonderful how little my opponent, in his ordinary tone and expression, recognises the very existence of such a class as the uneducated. He says, *e.g.*, that if clerics do not study "Shakespeare and Scott," "one distinct note of inferiority is thus at once established for them as compared with their *fellow-men*." He words his sentence, as though laymen, who care nothing about Shakespeare and Scott, are not a priest's "fellow-men" at all. Again, he makes an appeal after this fashion: "I would most earnestly put it to those who advocate an opposite view, whether they are prepared to acquiesce in a decidedly lower average of education and intelligence among the clergy than *among the laity* as a normal condition of things; whether they consider it desirable, or even safe, that *men* should be unable to look with intellectual respect on them." He does not seem to class the uneducated as "men," or to regard them as any part of the "laity" at all.* And he maintains, without explanation or qualification, that "the style and matter of literature" touches most "closely on the duties of the confessional." How incredibly absurd! Take any priest, the most highly and universally educated you can, who has gone through the exhausting and anxious work of the confessional for one single evening among a poor population, and ask him how great a benefit has accrued to him in his task from his study of Shakespeare and Scott. He will answer with me, "How incredibly absurd!"

"X.Y.Z." chiefly bases his recommendation of 'literary' pursuits, on the accession of influence which a priest would obtain by means of them. Here, then, is my first answer: even if he gained the rich, he would lose the poor. In my second argument I shall still proceed on the hypothesis (I am convinced a very false one), that a priest, educated according to my opponent's prescription, *would* have some special weight with the educated class. But, I ask, *why* is it so important that our educated laymen should *be* influenced? Because we are so specially in *need* of religious truth. We are continually tempted, *e.g.*, to think, that so only we try to avoid mortal sin, we may quite innocently make this world our main end and our main enjoyment; and when those salutary lessons which we so much require are pressed on our attention, we are only too happy to salve our conscience with the thought, that our reprover knows nothing of the matter, having no "breadth and largeness of intelligence." It is of very great value, therefore, that these whole-

* I am not unmindful of the fact that he speaks, shortly afterwards, of "the educated and half-educated classes." His *meaning* is, of course, clear enough in the passage which I quote; I am criticising its *tone* and *expression*.

some admonitions should be given us by men, whom it is impossible to accuse of being "narrow" and "monkish;" and who are evidently quite as well qualified as ourselves, both by nature and attainment, for the pursuit of this world's various goods.

But, then, if our priest, in the course of his literary training, have lost one particle of his interior spirit; if he have learned to gaze with less steadiness and simplicity of vision on God and the things of God; if he have forgotten in any degree the habit of weighing all earthly things in the heavenly balance;—not only he confers no benefit on God's cause, but he does it the greatest disservice. He confers no benefit; for such lessons as he will wish to inculcate are not higher than those views which we laymen already hold. He inflicts great injury; because we are confirmed in our low and degrading ways, by meeting with an authorised priest who feels against them no great objection.

And so on a larger scale. Great service is done to the Catholic cause, so far as persons, deeply imbued with Catholic principles, are able to cope with the world on its own ground; to meet the sophistries, to treat fairly the honest difficulties, which are put forward by educated men. But what service is done by the mere fact of Catholics possessing great worldly influence, unless they *use* that influence for pure Catholic truth? If they themselves have no hearty love, nay, and no full apprehension, of that truth, they can do nothing *for* God, and will probably do much *against* Him.

Now I have already argued that "X.Y.Z.'s" system would eminently tend to produce this very effect; to dull and enfeeble, and that in no ordinary degree, the spiritual vision of those unhappy victims who should be its recipients. Even, then, were I to grant that priests of this kind would possess great influence over highly educated men, whether Catholics or Protestants, such influence would be for evil and not for good. Those very persons, who will have been trained for the spiritual benefit of us educated laymen, will rather be our spiritual ruin.

I now, thirdly, maintain, that there is no imaginable mode of education which would more utterly incapacitate a priest from influencing the really educated, than that which my opponent has devised. He considers that the intellect at least would be greatly benefited by his method. On this question, then, I will first join issue. And I will advocate the extremely opposite proposition, viz.: that my opponent's method would generate nothing but intellectual imbecility. On this matter, at least, my opponent and I have common ground from which to start. He every where implies an adherence to those principles which F. Newman has stated, as to the true mode of intellectual culture. For myself also I most strongly hold the truth of those principles; and I will bring them therefore to bear on the question before us.

The earliest end aimed at in intellectual training, is compelling the various faculties actively to exert themselves, and counteracting the habit of a "mere passive reception of images and thoughts." Now,

for the purpose of securing this exertion and invigoration of the intellect, the study of language and the study of mathematics have quite a peculiar value. In these studies "the learner is compelled to be an actor, not a mere spectator, in the intellectual scene."* It is impossible that he can content himself with a barren and passive remembrance of facts, because he is compelled to acquire and exhibit new *powers of mind*. A student who has learned to solve an equation which he never before saw, or to translate accurately at first sight an involved Greek or German passage, must necessarily have given his mind active employment.

Now, how would this early discipline be affected, by the free and unchecked study of general literature? Of course most unfavourably. The mental energies, instead of being braced and strengthened, would be dissipated and enervated by a passive reception of miscellaneous facts. That state of mind would be engendered, against which F. Newman is never weary of inveighing, such as may be studied in the case of the inimitable Mr. White.† This interesting youth has read all the reviews and magazines, and Russell's *Modern Europe*, and Burke's *Orations*, and the *Anti-Jacobin* (I am quoting from memory); and what has resulted? He has acquired no mental power whatever; no, nor the real knowledge of any one fact.

Passing from this earlier discipline, the next matter which engages F. Newman's interest would be, that our students shall obtain "a conception of development from and around a common centre." "There is no enlargement of mind," he says, "unless there be a comparison of ideas one with another, as they come before the mind, and a systematising of them. We feel our minds to be growing and expanding *then*, when we not only learn, but refer what we learn to what we know already. It is not a mere addition to our knowledge which is illumination, but the locomotion, the movement onwards, of that moral centre to which both what we know and what we are learning, the accumulating mass of our acquirements, gravitate. And therefore a truly great intellect is one which takes a connected view of old and new, past and present, far and near, and which has an insight into the influence of all these one on another; without which there is no whole and no centre. It possesses the knowledge, not only of things, but also of their mutual and true relations; knowledge, not merely considered as acquirement, but as philosophy."

Now I have already urged, how important, on ascetical grounds, is the habit of viewing all the various facts and theories which come under our cognisance by the Gospel standard. It follows, from F. Newman's principles, that this habit eminently promotes also true enlargement of mind; and so indeed he himself observes. "It is often remarked of uneducated persons, who have hitherto thought little of the unseen world, that, on their turning to God, looking into themselves, regulating their hearts, reforming their conduct,

* Whewell.

† Newman's *Essay on University Subjects*.

and meditating on death and judgment, heaven and hell, they seem to become, in point of intellect, different beings from what they were. Before, they took things as they came, and thought no more of one thing than another. But now every event has a meaning; they have their own estimate of whatever happens to them; they are mindful of times and seasons, and compare the present with the past; and the world, no longer dull, monotonous, unprofitable, and hopeless, is a various and complicated drama, with parts and an object and an awful moral."

On the other hand, undoubtedly those who bring together an immense number of facts, and view them in their mutual relations upon worldly principles, these obtain great enlargement of mind. As the former is Christian, so the latter is anti-Christian, enlargement. And the latter, I maintain, is the case with the Protestant universities. He who there thoroughly gives himself to the studies of the place, obtains a first-rate mental discipline, at the expense of an awful moral disadvantage; for the truths of Christianity have no practical hold on him whatever. Nay, and no speculative hold; for they produce no impression whatever on his habitual view of men and things. I find a valuable corroboration of this statement from a writer in your last number, to whom I have already referred. "The Protestant," he says, "practically ignores the personality of God, as . . . the real and living object of adoration, obedience, and love." Such is the result in which the Protestant educational system issues; and it is for this reason that I cannot help regarding the Protestant Universities as most unsuitable models for Catholic lay education. All will admit it to be far better that our gentry should continue to be educated as they are, than that they should obtain higher intellectual discipline at so tremendous a sacrifice. For myself, I have never been able to see, how, on the Protestant university system, this sacrifice can possibly be avoided.

Passing, however, from this short digression, I proceed with my remarks. Here, then, are two different, but equally efficacious, modes of mental enlargement. That great body of human facts which 'literature' contemplates—the course of the world, the various habits, aims, dispositions, of worldly men—may be made most powerfully conducive to intellectual cultivation, if we learn to contemplate them in their mutual relations from the worldly standpoint. But, on the other hand, they may be studied so as to produce, not mental enlargement, but mental imbecility; and "X. Y. Z.'s" proposal is admirably adapted to that end.

"X. Y. Z." would not, of course, wish that religious truths shall have no hold at all on the mind of an ecclesiastical student; that they shall "lie like a *caput mortuum* at the bottom of his mind, like some foreign substance, in no way influencing the current of his thoughts or the tone of his feelings."* On the contrary, he desires that they shall be really and efficaciously inculcated. He is com-

* J. S. Mill.

mendably desirous, indeed, that we may escape that most serious evil, of theology "losing its point of contact with human thought and life, and crystallising into a kind of frost-work of technical terminology." Yet, on the other hand, he is at least equally desirous that there shall be a keen and eager study of that 'literature,' which implies at every step principles diametrically opposed to those of theology. Here, then, is his newly-devised theory of mental discipline, which is to put our old 'narrowness' to the blush. His pattern-student is explicitly and formally to be taught one set of principles; implicitly and unconsciously to imbibe principles diametrically opposite; and no hint is to be given him of this violent opposition. What an unmeaning and confused jumble of notions will occupy the poor youth's brain, prevented by his teacher from mastering the real significance and extent of any one idea, however prominent and important! Here is the choicest possible method for "dwarfing the faculties" and "stunting intellectual development." The poor youth, who might be sacrificed to the experiment, would grow up as narrow, stupid, and self-sufficient, as he would be worldly and unmortified.

Supposing, therefore, that our gentry have received a thoroughly effective and large intellectual culture, there is no priest who would have so little influence with them as one of this sort; for there would be none so dull, so pretentious, so intrusive. Now let the following facts be further considered, which bear in the same direction.

"X. Y. Z." speaks of the clergy "mixing freely with" the higher classes of laity "during the period of education." Here again is one of those wonderful inaccuracies which abound in his two letters. If our gentry are to receive the education which my opponent desires, they cannot possibly bring it to a close till about the age of twenty-two. On the other hand, our priests are ordinarily ordained at the age of twenty-three; and five years are devoted to the exclusive study of professional subjects.* No one, indeed, who has given his mind to the question, will think five years one day too long; but observe what follows. The future priest must close at the age of eighteen that part of his studies, which "X. Y. Z." imagines him to share with laymen. So far, then, from his being on an equality with these laymen in his literary attainments, he will be vastly their inferior. My opponent seems to have some practical knowledge of a Protestant education. I will ask him, therefore, what is the kind of comparison between a youth, on the one hand, who has thoroughly devoted himself to university studies; and a youth, on the other hand, who has not gone to the university at all, but enters into life on quitting a public school at eighteen years old. If they are brought into contact, the former feels the latter to be like a barbarian, so vast is his intellectual inferiority. Such, then, after all, is the relation which "X. Y. Z." would establish between our priests and gentry.

* I refer, of course, to the study of "philosophy" and "theology."

On the other hand, laymen who are thoroughly well educated in *their* way, would greatly value and admire a priest thoroughly well educated in *his*. True, he would be vastly their inferior in the knowledge of "Shakespeare and Scott;" but they would to no less an extent be his inferiors in the somewhat more important knowledge, of God and those other beings, who are to be our companions for Eternity. And, depend on it, even very worldly-minded laymen never experience so much respect for a priest, as when they feel that he is not ashamed of his profession; when they see that he is quite absorbed in its appropriate thoughts, and practically aware of their unparalleled magnitude and importance. Add to this, that (as has often been remarked) no interior man can be really vulgar. The half-educated mongrel *littérateur*, whom "X. Y. Z.'s" plan would produce, such a person indeed would be offensive to the refined tastes of a gentleman. But wherever there is humility, unselfishness, constant consideration for others, all true gentlemen are attracted by the exhibition.

I have now considered "X. Y. Z.'s" chief recommendations by the two tests which I originally proposed. I have written far more hastily than I could wish, on a subject of vast extent and most painful importance; but I was very desirous of being in time for your January Number. The views, indeed, here expressed, have all been for many years familiar to my mind; but if I could have had more time, I might have developed them far more clearly, and brought many additional arguments to their support.

At the same time, I have only aimed at treating *part* of the question. "X. Y. Z." has attacked the fundamental principles on which the whole Catholic system of ecclesiastical training is founded. Even apart from the question of authority, my own personal convictions are most unhesitating, and most deeply-seated, in favour of these principles; and I have wished therefore, according to my power and opportunity, to illustrate and defend them. There is, of course, another totally different question, that of *fact*; how far this or that seminary, whether St. Sulpice or any other, is effectively conducted *upon* those recognised principles. But as "X. Y. Z." has not touched upon this question, I should have no excuse for doing so, even if I had the inclination; for I feel most deeply that these are no subjects for public discussion. And I have certainly not the inclination, for I am not sufficiently acquainted with individual facts to form any definite judgment on the matter.

And now, in taking leave of my opponent, I cannot help once more protesting most earnestly against the course which he has adopted for giving currency to his opinions. I feel strongly that on many questions—for instance, on various particulars which concern lay education—great benefit may be conferred on us English Catholics by free public discussion. It is, for that very reason the more unfortunate, that "X. Y. Z." has adopted a course, which must

bring into discredit the whole system of public discussion altogether. For let us see the state of the case.

He maintains that nothing can be more deplorable than those principles of clerical education, which he considers to be prevalent throughout Catholic Christendom; which he regards as having their natural home, indeed, on the Continent, but as prevailing to a great extent in our English colleges also. It is his conviction that these principles lead to the worst results, both moral and intellectual, and imperatively require a revolutionary reform. In other words, he is persuaded that the whole body of Catholic bishops, both here and abroad, are training their priests by a method, which is debasing to their moral character, and destructive of their most important influence. Before what grave ecclesiastical tribunal does he prefer this appalling accusation? Before the miscellaneous readers of a lay periodical. Every one who can afford to buy a copy of the *Rambler*, or can borrow one from a friend, is called on to exercise his intellect, freely and without favour or affection, on such questions as these: (1) What is precisely that ecclesiastical spirit which a seminary should form? (2) What is the best mode of securing that spirit? (3) What are in fact the regulations of our English colleges? (4) How far is it true that all Catholic bishops unite in supporting a system which may "occasionally" indeed "make a saint by accident" (for what Catholic educational system *can* be so deplorable, as that "*occasionally*," and "*by accident*," a saint may not emerge from it?), but whose direct *tendency* (for which alone, of course, its maintainers are responsible), is to "make sneaks by the score"?

If the body of laymen may permissibly be invited to exercise their free private judgment on such issues as these, nay, and to express the conclusion at which they arrive, we may expect, on opening any number of your Periodical, to find a letter, signed perhaps "U.V.W.," in which the question of clerical celibacy is proposed for "ventilation." Your new correspondent, following in "X.Y.Z.'s" footsteps, will not be "writing an essay on the subject," but "simply suggesting hints for the consideration of those better qualified to judge." He will "*briefly jot down a few questions which have occurred to his mind*," and will "seek rather to ventilate the question than to lay down the law." After this modest preamble, allegations will follow, expressed with the greatest confidence and vehemence of language, that the whole practice of clerical celibacy produces the most frightful evils. And he will conclude by saying, that if we wish "to win back this great-hearted Anglo-Saxon people, with its strong will" and the rest of it, we must really give up that institution against which they are so invincibly prejudiced. A married clergy, perhaps he may add, can alone succeed in influencing a people so given to marriage. I really think there is quite as much meaning in this sentence, as in many of my opponent's plausibly-sounding utterances; nor can I see that in any one particular the imaginary "U.V.W." will go one step beyond the precedent set him by "X.Y.Z."

We are inevitably, then, led to inquire, What are the intellectual qualifications exhibited by your correspondent for this supreme ecclesiastical censorship to which he has elected himself? And we shall find them, I think, just what we might have anticipated from the course which he has pursued. There is one which I can unreservedly praise—his style. I have felt, indeed, sensibly throughout, at what great disadvantage I have had to contend, with my bald and awkward diction, against a writer possessing so ready a command of masculine and vigorous language. Yet this very command of language has perhaps its disadvantages; certainly it seems in the present case to have blinded my opponent to the extraordinary poverty of thought beneath. To myself, even the monstrous audacity of his accusation is less amazing, than the recklessness and inconsistency of those statements, the paltriness and imbecility of those arguments, by which he has attempted to sustain it.

I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,
W. G. W.

Current Events.

HOME AFFAIRS.

Repeal Agitation.

THE domestic first-fruit of our policy on the Italian question has appeared in the form of a meeting, which was held at Dublin on the 4th of December, to inaugurate an agitation for the repeal of the Union. The O'Donoghue presided, and was supported by Mr. Maguire, who proposed the following resolution: "That British ministers and other influential persons in England having recognised and supported the principle that persons who are discontented with their governments may rightfully change or abolish those governments, by violent means if they cannot do so peaceably, and in place of them set up rulers and governments of their own choice, we are now assembled, peaceably, to inform our rulers that they and the existing form of government for Ireland are not of our choosing, and do not possess our confidence; and that we earnestly desire the restoration of that native legislature of which our country was fraudulently deprived." The resolution, of course, was enthusiastically adopted. And then, proceeding from theory to practice, Mr. Underwood, a Presbyterian minister, improved the occasion by introducing a petition to the two Houses of Parliament, setting forth the desire of the meeting, "that, in accordance with those views on popular rights which have been frequently expressed by her Majesty's Government, her Majesty may be pleased to direct that the Irish people shall be allowed to choose their own rulers and form of government, such choice to be declared by ballot and universal suffrage."

As a diversion in Mr. Disraeli's interest, the movement perhaps was not without adroitness; nor is there any reason why it should offend the taste of those who accept his canons of political morality. For the *argumentum ad hominem* against ministers is complete; and the temptation to

use it could hardly be suppressed without the acknowledgment of a settled standard of right and wrong. But once admit such a standard, and a thing ceases to be lawful or unlawful merely because Lord John Russell says it is so. Conduct becomes the expression of principle; and a principle does not vary with the varying circumstances to which it applies. The particular method suggested by Mr. Underwood for effecting the repeal of the Union—"first, by force, and secondly," as a *pis aller*, "by reason"—may perhaps be as idiosyncratic as it is startling; but the O'Donoghue and Mr. Maguire have, at all events, fully committed themselves to "those views of popular rights" of which the ministerial policy with regard to Italy has been the natural and necessary result. Other people have, for the most part, been content to confine their approval to words; but Lord John Russell will be entitled to point to the promoters of this demonstration as men who have given his theory that unreserved and crowning sanction which is implied in their spontaneously adopting it as the basis of their own public action. They may have the satisfaction of knowing that, if it should ever be necessary for him to meet a national demand for repeal, he will have to accommodate his principles to his position: he, meanwhile, secures the advantage of removing the Italian question, as far as their opposition is concerned, from the ground of principle altogether.

For either there is such a thing as the *duty* of subjects to their rulers, or there is not. If there is, then the position in which these gentlemen contemplate the possibility of placing the Irish people is morally wrong. If there is not, then moral wrong is excluded also from the position in which the ministerial policy has supported the various Italian peoples, and the opposition to that policy is narrowed to grounds of mere expe-

diency or feeling. The new repealers may take their choice. Their satire is pungent, but it cuts both ways. They cannot be the instigators of rebellion in Ireland, and, at the same time, the champions of settled government in Italy.

The Maori War.

Our present dispute with the natives of New Zealand dates from March 1859, and springs out of the anxiety of the settlers at Taranaki to acquire some land which lies to the south of the Waitara river. They complain that, for want of this land, "they have not sufficient pasturage for their flocks, and that immigrants and capitalists are driven to seek in other provinces the accommodation which Taranaki cannot, under present circumstances, afford;" and the governor, in his first published despatch on the subject, addressed to Sir E. B. Lytton, speaks of the land in question as "essentially necessary for the consolidation of the province, as well as for the use of the settlers." The Maoris, however, to whom it belongs, refuse, as a rule, to sell any part of it. They do so both on social and political grounds—both because they have a warm attachment to the inheritance of their ancestors, and also because they feel that the absorption of their territory by European settlers is at once an instrument and symbol of the gradual extinction of their race. This latter feeling, though very widely diffused, is naturally strongest among the chiefs; and the Maori law, recognised and guaranteed by the treaty of Waitangi, enables the chief to interpose an effective veto on the alienation of territory belonging to the members of his tribe.

For the native ownership of land appears to be in a sort of transition state between communism and individual property. The individual has his rights against the other members of his tribe; and the tribe, both in its members and as represented by its chief, has also its rights against him. But the precise limit on either side is, as might be expected, not very clearly defined; and there are qualifying circumstances—such as conquest and temporary posses-

sion by another tribe, the absence of the chief for a longer or shorter period, and various others—which may so complicate the relations of the different parties concerned, as to render it next to impossible in any given case, to distinguish justice amidst their conflicting claims.

It was probably, therefore, a very wise discretion which the governor proposed to exercise when he declared at the outset, to a meeting of natives held at Taranaki, that, whatever pressure might be put on him by the settlers, he "would never consent to buy land without an undisputed title." Had he adhered to this declaration, the war would certainly have been avoided; but he seems to have scarcely announced his policy before he deliberately abandoned it. At the very meeting at which the declaration was made, a native called "Teira offered some land for sale, which he and his relatives desired to dispose of to the Government." Thereupon Kingi, the chief of Teira's tribe, rose and formally protested against the sale, on the ground that the land was his. His right in it had descended to him from his father; and the old man, before his death, appears to have required and obtained a promise from his son, in the presence of the leading men of the tribe, that he would never sell it. The land in question was part of the coveted territory of Waitara; and Kingi's protest was expressed in these terms: "Listen, governor, notwithstanding Teira's offer, I will not permit the sale of Waitara to the Pakeha. Waitara is in my hands. I will not give it up; I will not; I will not; I will not." And, having said this, "he and his followers abruptly withdrew."

If words have any meaning, the land which was the subject of this discussion could hardly be said to have an "undisputed title." But for "undisputed" the governor now mentally substituted "valid;" and instead of subordinating the acquisition of land to the maintenance of peace and good feeling in the district, according to his original intention, he determined at once to throw down the gauntlet to Kingi, and to get the land at all hazards, provided Teira were competent to sell it.

The next step, therefore, was to investigate Teira's title; and the governor's method of doing so was simply to refer the question to his own district land-commissioner,—a subordinate agent, appointed, paid, and removable by the Government, and personally interested in the issue of the investigation. This, of course, was precisely analogous to the act of a man who consults his attorney with regard to the matter of any suit in which he proposes to become a party; and so far the proceeding was perfectly correct. But the governor's view appears to have been that this land-agent, who was virtually plaintiff in the cause, was at the same time its most appropriate judge. It never seems to have struck him that an impartial tribunal, an open court, or an examination of witnesses on oath, had any value whatever in the decision of a disputed claim to real property; and accordingly, as soon as his own agent had given an opinion in his favour, he treated the question as settled; took measures for having the land immediately surveyed; and ordered that, in case of any opposition being offered to the surveying party, the troops should be at once called in.

Resistance *was* offered, and the troops were called in. Presently other native tribes joined the original insurgents; then the military were reinforced. The quarrel quickly grew into a war; and, after a campaign in which the bravery of our soldiers has been far more conspicuous than their success, the Maoris are left in possession of a pah which 1000 of our men cannot venture to attack, and are reported to be gathering their forces together as though for a desperate struggle.

In communicating to the Colonial Office his intention of provoking a war, the governor pleasantly observed, that if blood were once shed it would be impossible to foresee the consequences. Some of them, at

least, will have been brought home to his consciousness by this time, and there are others which it requires no extraordinary degree of prescience for any bystander to anticipate. The natives possess the fastnesses of the country. They can by turns elude, entangle, and surprise our men in the complicated intricacies of bush warfare. And though their final triumph is of course impossible, we may have to purchase ours by a terrible expenditure of human life, and at the cost of an increased taxation utterly out of proportion to the cause of quarrel. What we have at all times most to guard against on the part of the Maoris is their union under a single chief; and it is unquestionable that the war has done more to forward this union than it would have been possible to effect by any other means within the same period. Discontented with a rule which seems to them to aim deliberately at the extinction of their race, the chiefs have now for some time established a "Maori king," elected to rule over the natives in the same way as the governor rules over the settlers. To this Maori king the land at present in dispute has been formally made over by the insurgent chief; and if the war proceeds, we shall probably have to encounter, not merely the opposition of a single tribe with its casual allies, but the hostility of half a nation. That the immediate results "to the scattered European population in the colony could not fail to be ruinous and distressing in the extreme," the governor declared himself from the beginning to be aware. It would have been fortunate if he had also observed that the immediate cause gives point, if not full justification, to the Maori policy, and throws on his own government the odium of an act which no ingenuity can reconcile with the first principles of natural justice.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

Italy.

Victor Emmanuel's proclamation to the people of Southern Italy from Ancona was published Oct. 9, 1860. In it he does not defend his position on grounds of law or morals, but on physical and organic necessity, urging that a strong hand is necessary to vindicate Italy for the Italians, and to prevent its becoming "the nest of cosmopolitan sects assembling there either to hatch reactionary plots, or to further the objects of universal demagoguy," and declares that his troops march into the southern provinces merely to make the popular will respected, and to enable it to manifest itself by universal suffrage. Not long afterwards, the fall of Capua and the battle of the Garigliano (Nov. 3) opened to him the road to Naples. The voting for or against annexation had been taken Oct. 31, and displayed the same appearance of unanimity that all universal votes have recently put on. Nov. 9, the king entered Naples, in the midst of more rain than enthusiasm. Garibaldi was seated by him in his carriage; but the two men, however friendly personally, represented incompatible interests, and were soon to part. The king published a proclamation to "the Neapolitan and Sicilian peoples," accepting the noble provinces which universal suffrage had given him, and promising the inauguration of a government which should secure freedom to the people, and severe rectitude to public opinion. But this requires the coöperation of all honest men; for when power is limited by law and based upon freedom, its influence for good can only be in direct proportion to the public and private virtues of the people. "We must show Europe, that if the irresistible force of events broke through the conventionalities grounded on the calamities by which Italy was for centuries afflicted, we know how to restore to the united nation the guarantee of those unchangeable principles without which every society is weak, and every authority insecure."

Though Garibaldi had ostensibly introduced the king to the new capital he had conquered for him, yet there was no possibility of concealing the fact that the "cosmopolitan sect" which furthered "universal demagoguy" had concentrated around the late dictator. When his request that the new provinces might be committed to him for a year was refused, he resolved to part company with the king, and to retire for a season to his sea-rock at Caprera. Already, on the last day of October, in presenting the Hungarians with their new colours, he had used language towards the Pope to which Victor Emmanuel could not afford to lend his name; he had said that the Pope-king was blinded by personal ambition to oppose the national movement, and to retard the complete liberation of Italy. Garibaldi was a Christian; "but this Pope, who wishes that men should be slaves, who asks from the powerful of the earth fetters and chains for the Italians,—this Pope-king does not know Christ; he lies against his own religion." "The genius of evil for Italy is the Pope-king." With this slander he mixed up some graver matter. "It is your duty to educate the people—educate it to be Italian. Education gives liberty; educating the people means the power to assure and defend its independence. On a strong and healthy education of the people depend the liberty and the grandeur of Italy." And in his address to his "companions in arms" before his departure, Nov. 10, he alluded in no very respectful terms to the Turin cabinet, and left to them a legacy which seemed to promise a harvest of the direst dangers. "Let timid *doctrinaires* depart from among us, to carry their servility and their fears elsewhere. . . . To arms, all of you! If March 1861 does not find a million of Italians in arms, then alas for liberty, alas for the life of Italy. . . . To-day I am obliged to retire, but for a few days only." The aim of this armament was to be the annexation of Rome and Venice to united Italy.

The king's first political act at Naples was to commit the government of the continental provinces to a lieutenant, who was to have the power, till parliament met, to publish any kind of act necessary to harmonise the union, and to provide for emergencies; foreign and military affairs were to be left to the central government. Farini was nominated lieutenant, and was directed by the king, in a letter dated Nov. 14, to turn his first attention to the subject of popular education: "I am pained at learning how little care the poorer classes had received from the institutions for popular education. The religious and civil instruction of my people has been the constant thought of my reign: liberal institutions, to be useful to all, must be understood by all." The king intrusted to his lieutenant 200,000 lire for this object, and directed him to encourage the formation of associations to carry out "this work of Christian and civil progress, to which both as men and as rulers we owe the utmost solicitude."

Dec. 1. The king was received with extraordinary enthusiasm at Palermo by some 400,000 Sicilians, with the Archbishop of Palermo at their head. A royal proclamation reminded the Sicilians that one of the king's ancestors had worn their crown, and that his own brother had been chosen in 1845 to reign over them. "The government I come here to inaugurate is to be one of regeneration and concord. It will sincerely respect religion, and maintain in their integrity the most ancient prerogatives which are the glory of the Sicilian Church, and the stronghold of civil power. It will found an administration which will build up again the moral principles of a well-ordered society, and by an incessant economical progress restore the fertility of the soil [!], the commerce, and the maritime activity of the country."

The new government, however, was not sufficiently settled to go on smoothly. The king himself was badly received in Naples, and Garibaldians and Royalists caused alternate troubles. Farini was the object of all kinds of insult, and was

on more than one occasion obliged to resort to violent measures. The Royalists took occasion from the protracted defence of Gaeta to stir up reactionary movements in the provinces, especially in the Abruzzi, where the state of siege was proclaimed by the military authorities, though immediately annulled by Farini.

Francis II. at Gaeta showed no signs of yielding; he dismissed the troops who could not be received into the fortress to the Roman territory, where they were disarmed by the French and Pontifical authorities, and fed at the Pope's expense, till the bulk of them returned to the Abruzzi and other provinces, to join the guerrillas. The queen-mother and her younger children sought an asylum at Rome. The king addressed a very well-written protest to all European powers, and received promises and pecuniary assistance from more than one. The French admiral moored his fleet in Gaeta, and not only prevented the Sardinians from bombarding the town, but also threatened to fire upon Admiral Persano if he attempted to molest the Bourbon army at the mouth of the Garigliano. This conduct, complicated with revivals of the name of Prince Murat, so contrary to the English policy which Napoleon expressed himself ready to adopt with regard to Italy, has since been modified, and French support has been withdrawn from Francis II.

The English policy with regard to Italy was thus announced by Lord John Russell in a despatch to Sir James Hudson, Oct. 27. He first mentions the acts by which the cabinets of France, Russia, Prussia, and Austria have shown their displeasure at the Sardinian invasion of the Papal and Neapolitan States.

He will not attempt to decide the technical questions whether the Pope was justified in maintaining his authority by foreign levies, or whether the King of the Two Sicilies can be said to have abdicated while still holding out at Capua and Gaeta.

The questions are, Were the people of Italy justified in asking the assistance of the King of Sardinia to relieve them from governments with which they were discontented? and was the King of Sardinia justified in

fighting for the Romans and Neapolitans?

The motives which induced these populations to join willingly in the subversion of their governments were, (1) that justice and the protection of personal liberty were so ill secured, that the overthrow of the governments seemed a necessary preliminary to any improvement; and (2) the conviction that Italian unity was the only protection of Italy from foreign control.

On these two motives Lord John Russell pronounces that the Italians are the best judges of their own interests. He adds that Vattel, discussing the support given by the Netherlands to William III. against James II., justifies it, because the people had for good reasons taken up arms against the government: and the English government would not be justified in saying that the Southern Italians had not good reasons.

But it is asserted that the Romans and Neapolitans were attached to their governments, and that the governments were only subverted by the intrigue and force of Sardinian agents and foreign adventurers.

Lord John Russell, considering that the Pope could not raise a native army, and that Garibaldi made so easy a conquest of Naples, thinks that there must have been universal dissatisfaction; and that this feeling, in Sicily at least, was not capricious, he proves by the constancy with which it has been manifested at each opportunity. Not but that it is a misfortune to have to sever the ties that bind people to their sovereign. "Notions of allegiance become confused; the succession of the throne is disputed; adverse parties threaten the peace of society; rights and pretensions are opposed to each other, and mar the harmony of the state." But in the Italian revolution all these evils have been mitigated by good temper and forbearance, by public opinion checking the extreme views of democrats and the excesses of public triumph; and a constitutional monarchy has been formed round the throne of a prince who represents an ancient and glorious dynasty.

The note of Baron Schleinitz, the Prussian minister, condemned the Italian movement as violating trea-

ties and fostering revolutions; and, on the other hand, seemed to approve of it, as representing the cause of nationality. The Prussian liberals were indignant that Prussian policy had not yet detached itself from Legitimist theories; and the Austrian party was indignant that the movement for German unity should be helped on by Prussia.

The protests of Austria and Russia proceeded on the principles of legality, legitimacy, and the inviolability of treaties. Their statesmen do not consider the non-moral forces, not amenable to law, which act in human societies.

Though the King of Sardinia invited the Cardinal-Archbishop of Naples back to his see, and promised to respect the Sicilian church, his lieutenant in Umbria, Pepoli, has provided for the extinction of all the religious houses, without even excepting the Sanctuary of St. Francis of Assisi, which, even as a living historical monument, deserved another kind of treatment. This policy of the King of Italy has called forth the following noble protest from the General of the Jesuits:

"Sire,—The Superior-General of the Company of Jesus approaches respectfully the foot of the throne of your Majesty to obtain justice and reparation for the grave wrongs his order has recently suffered in Italy; and if his demands are vain, at least publicly to protest against such acts of injustice.

"After the first agitations in Italy, which took place at the end of 1847 and at the commencement of 1848, all the establishments and colleges possessed by the Company of Jesus in the Sardinian States, whether in the Island of Sardinia or on the mainland, were suppressed, its goods confiscated, its members ignominiously dispersed.

"To give an appearance of legality to those acts of injustice, a decree was published, posterior to that which suppressed the said company, which confiscated its property, and imposed sundry gratuitously vexatious obligations upon its members.

"That decree was issued without the knowledge of your august father, Charles Albert, and even contrary to his intentions; for during the whole

of his reign that king showed himself favourable to our order, and when the storm burst he exhorted the fathers to remain firm; perceiving the fears of some of them, he complained to the superiors that they did not place sufficient confidence in his word and intention to protect them. Although the decree could not have a retro-active effect, it has been, nevertheless, invoked to legitimatise the act of our spoliation; it has been maintained and put in full force by the government which since then presides over the destinies of the kingdom.

"Dating from the war of Italy, which took place last year, up to the present moment, the company has lost in Lombardy 3 establishments and colleges, 6 in the duchy of Modena, 11 in the Papal States, 19 in the kingdom of Naples, and 15 in Sicily. Every where the company has been literally stripped of all its property, personal or landed. Its members, to the number of about 1500, have been turned out of their establishments in the towns; they have been led by armed force like malefactors from country to country, thrown into the public prisons, and grossly maltreated; they have even been prevented seeking an asylum in the bosom of some pious family, and in many localities neither their age nor infirmities have been respected.

"All these acts have been committed without any thing culpable in the eye of the law having been brought against the victims, without judicial form; the proceeding was most savage and despotic.

"Had such acts been done in a popular rising by an ignorant and furious populace, perhaps we should be able to put up with them in silence; but as an attempt has been made to legitimatise them by the Sardinian law; as the Provisional Governments established in the States of Modena and of the Church, as the Dictator of the Two Sicilies himself, have supported them on the authority of the Sardinian Government; as, finally, to give strength to those iniquitous decrees and sanction their execution, the name of your Majesty has been, and still is, invoked,—I can no longer remain a silent spectator of so great an act of

injustice; and in my position as supreme Head of the Order I feel myself rigorously bound to demand justice and satisfaction, and to protest before God and before man, so that religious resignation and meekness may not appear to have degenerated into a weakness which might be taken as a confession of culpability or as an abandonment of our rights.

"I therefore protest solemnly, in the form which I think best, against the suppression of our establishments and colleges, against the proscriptions, banishments, imprisonments, violence, and insults inflicted upon my brethren in religion.

"I protest, before all Catholics, in the name of the rights of the Holy Church, sacrilegiously violated.

"I protest in the name of the benefactors and founders of our establishments and colleges, whose wishes and express intentions in founding those pious works in the interest of the dead and of the living are thus deprived of effect.

"I protest in the name of the right of property, discarded and trodden under foot by brute force.

"I protest in the name of the right of citizen and inviolability of person, neither of which can be despoiled without accusation, trial, and sentence.

"I protest in the name of the rights of humanity, so scandalously outraged in the persons of so many feeble old men turned out of their quiet asylum, deprived of all support, thrown into the public highway without the means of existence.

"If, unhappily, I can give no other aid to my brethren, they will see at least by this step that their common father is not indifferent to their sad position.

"I address this protest to your Majesty's conscience. I place it upon the tomb of Charles Emmanuel IV., illustrious predecessor of your Majesty, who forty-five years ago voluntarily left the throne, now occupied by your Majesty, came to live and die with us, dressed in the clothes and bound by the oaths of the Company of Jesus, and professing in our novitiate at Rome, where his blessed ashes now repose, that mode of life which the Government

of your Majesty has persecuted with fierce calumny and hatred.

"The remembrance of benefits constantly conferred in past times by the illustrious House of Savoy on the Company of Jesus, and the sublime character with which your Majesty is invested, give me hope that my supplications and protestations will not be unavailing.

"But if the voice of so many rights trodden under foot should not be listened to by earthly tribunals, I will then appeal to that supreme and terrible tribunal of a holy, just, and all-powerful God, before whom oppressed innocence will infallibly be reestablished by the Eternal Judge, the King of kings, the Lord of lords. It is in the hands of that God that I place our whole cause, and, fully reassured as regards ourselves, I supplicate Him to inspire your Majesty, and the men who advise you, with sentiments of justice and equity towards so many innocent men, my unjustly persecuted and oppressed children.

"Moreover, under all circumstances, my brethren and myself will console ourselves in having been found worthy to suffer for Christ's sake, with the satisfaction of our consciences of not having given any ground for this revival of ancient hatred, unless it is to have preached the Cross of Jesus Christ, respect and obedience to the Holy Church and to its head the Sovereign Pontiff, submission and fidelity to Princes and to all authorities established by God.

"I remain your Majesty's most humble servant,

"PIERRE BECKX,
Superior-General of the
Company of Jesus.

"Rome, October 24, 1860."

The question of Roman finance, which seemed to be hopelessly involved by the loss of Umbria and the Marches, and which seemed so desperate that Rothschild, the Pope's banker at Paris, refused to pay the last dividends till the whole amount was remitted to him, has been further complicated by the enlistment of a new army of between 10,000 and 12,000 men, at an estimated expense of 2,700,000 scudi a year; this, added to the interest on the debt

(5,500,000 scudi), the civil list of Pope and Cardinals and expenses of the palaces (60,000); the pensions of the 1400 *employés* from Romagna, Umbria, and the Marches, who are now receiving their pay in Rome, and of the other retired public servants,—is said to raise the Roman expenditure to about 12,000,000 scudi a year. If the dividends were left unpaid, the expenditure would still be near 7,000,000.

On the other hand, the custom-house at Civita Vecchia, is estimated to produce for next year some 500,000 scudi, and the property-tax about the same amount. The *octroi* produces about 750,000, and the lottery and post-office, salt and tobacco, about 350,000. Here is an income of rather more than two millions against an expenditure of rather less than seven.

The chasm is to be filled up, if possible, by the collection of Peter's pence. The spontaneous gifts of the faithful, during the last fifteen months, have amounted to 2,000,000 scudi. From this time the collection is to be organised and managed by the great confraternity of St. Peter; but in France the government has already prohibited that association, and in Prussia it is not likely that the bureaucracy will allow what must appear to it to be a rival organisation. In non-Catholic countries, the clergy generally depend on the voluntary contributions of the faithful, and cannot long be expected to uphold very heartily that which will be a continual diminution of the ordinary clerical funds. In old times the Peter's pence formed only an insignificant item of the Papal income, and was collected in countries where the Church was splendidly endowed.

France.

Nov. 10. A new blow was aimed at ecclesiastical liberty in France by the publication of a circular of M. Billault, the Minister of the Interior, directed to the Prefects of the Provinces, and pointing out that episcopal documents, though hitherto exempted from the formalities required in other publications, had lately grown to be mere political pamphlets, criticising the events of Europe, discussing and attacking the

acts of government. To prevent this abuse, the government will not withdraw the exemption altogether, but will confine it to pastorals and *mandements* that treat *bonâ fide* only spiritual matters, and that are printed, not like pamphlets, but in the shape of placards to be stuck up at the church-doors. The former are to be subject to the usual regulations of the press. In this the government (according to M. Billault) only distinguishes between religion and politics — between the decisions which the Catholic must obey, and the opinions which the citizen may contradict; but makes no attack upon liberty.

About the same time, the same minister had published another circular, in which he declared all associations for the collection of Peter's pence illegal. In consequence of the indignation this caused, a *communiqué* was published in the journals of the 20th. M. Billault explained that "individual offerings are still free; that they may be forwarded either directly, or through the Bishop or Curé; but that the organisation of committees, each member with his list of ten or a hundred subscribers, was forbidden. "Liberty for spontaneous offerings, prohibition of committees and permanent associations," which may easily be turned into engines of political propaganda.

A day or two afterwards a provincial journal, *La France Centrale*, was suspended for two months for inserting a portion of M. Berryer's preface to a book on the French bar. This intolerable despotism filled up the measure of the interference of officials like M. Billault with the press. Since February 17, 1852, when the decree on the press was published, there had been 226 warnings, suspensions, or suppressions of journals, giving for the nine years an average of about one a fortnight. So far from all these arbitrary acts having been provoked by attacks on the State, as distinguished from criticisms upon its policy, many of them had been done upon the most frivolous pretexts. One provincial journal had been warned for disapproving of an artificial manure that had been recommended by the officials. The

Presse was warned for saying that France had sympathised with the coalition which overthrew the first Empire; and another Parisian journal for having argued that bank-notes ought to be a legal tender.

But on the 24th of November, Lewis Napoleon, either weary of servility and willing to give a turn to freedom, or frightened by the warning of the Neapolitan revolution, and unwilling to leave to Napoleon IV. a legacy like that of Ferdinand to Francis II.; or willing to throw the responsibility of such measures as are dimly sketched in the pamphlet *Pape et Empereur* off himself, and on to France—published the following decree:

"Desiring to afford to the great bodies of the State a more direct participation in the general policy of our Government, and a marked proof of our confidence, we have decreed and decree as follows:

"Art. 1. The Senate and Corps Legislatif shall annually vote an Address in reply to our Speech at the opening of the Session.

"Art. 2. The Address shall be discussed in presence of Government Commissioners, who will give to the Chambers the necessary explanations on the home and foreign policy of the Empire.

"Art. 3. To facilitate to the Legislative Body the expression of its opinion in framing laws, and the exercise of the right of amendment, Art. 54 of our decree of the 22d of March 1852 is revived, and the regulation of the Legislative Body is modified in the following manner:

"Immediately after the distribution of the *projets de loi*, and on a day fixed by the President, the Legislative Body, before appointing its committee, will hold a secret committee meeting; a general discussion will be opened on the *projet de loi*, in which the Government Commissioners will take part.

"This regulation is not applicable either to *projets de loi* of local interest or in cases of urgency."

"Art. 4. With a view to render the reports of the debates in the Senate and Legislative Body more prompt and more complete, the following project of *Senatus-Consultum* will be brought before the Senate:

"The reports of the sittings of the Senate and of the Legislative Body, drawn up by secretary-reporters, placed under the authority of the President of either Chamber, will be sent every evening to all the journals. Moreover, the debates of each sitting shall be taken down in shorthand, and published *in extenso* in the official paper of the following day.

"Art. 5. As long as the Session lasts, the Emperor will appoint Ministers without portfolios to defend the *projets de loi* of the Government before the Chambers, in concert with the members of the Council of State."

This was followed by several changes in the ministry, the most important being the appointment of M. Persigny to the Interior. The new minister, in a circular to the Prefects, dated Dec. 6, after a rather apocryphal account of the conditions of liberty of the press in England, announced the new principles on which the law of warnings, &c., was to be administered. It is to be done, not in the interest of the administration, but of the State. So that, while no provocations to substitute a new government or a new dynasty for the present are to be allowed, the press is to be permitted "to expose abuses in society and in the government, to discuss the acts of the administration, to reveal injustice, and to awaken social, political, commercial, and industrial life by the movement of ideas, of sentiments, and of contrary opinions." Still the power of the administration over the press is "discretionary;" limited by no law, checked by no juries; and of this France still complains, in spite of the decree of the 10th of December annulling all former warnings. As a supplement to this, all prosecutions in progress have been given up, and the suppressed journals are the only ones whose wounds have not been bound up.

As a necessary supplement to the decree of the 24th of November, the dissolution of the present chamber is required. This measure causes considerable fear among the talking ministers, the *tenors*, who apprehend that they would find themselves unequal to the management of a house which would probably contain several of the more prominent

members of the former free chambers.

A pamphlet, which appears, by the way in which the discussion is followed up by the semi-official press, to be a real indication of the Emperor's policy, has been published in Paris. Its object is to engage Francis Joseph to part with Venetia for a consideration, as Napoleon I. parted with Louisiana for 80,000,000 francs. The indemnity it proposes is 500,000,000 or 600,000,000 francs; and for that an expensive and dangerous province would be got rid of without dishonour, and the necessity of a new war in the spring would be obviated. No one at Vienna will hear of the project; but the pamphlet has been extensively circulated in Germany, with the object of bringing the weight of public opinion to bear on the Austrian cabinet.

Austria and Germany.

Most of our remarks on this head have been anticipated in the Article on Austria in this Number.

Baron Schmerling published, December 23, a circular to the governors of the provinces of the Austrian Empire, in which he explains the leading principles of his policy.

"It is the mission of the Ministers of State to carry out fully and effectively the resolutions and intentions of the Emperor, as expressed in the imperial manifesto of October 20.

"As regards freedom of religious worship, it is the will of the Emperor that political and civil rights shall in that respect also be preserved against any encroachment, and that the mutual relations of the different confessions shall be established upon an equitable footing, and upon the real love for one's neighbour.

"Public instruction will be promoted by every possible means.

"The free development of the nationalities is accorded."

With respect to the public press, every preventive interference is removed.

"The development of agriculture, commerce, and industry will be pursued with redoubled energy on the path hitherto followed.

"The communes will enjoy an independent existence.

"The administration of justice is

to be separated from the governmental administration.

"Publicity and the oral form of proceeding are to be introduced into the civil and penal courts of law."

As regards the Provincial Statutes, the Minister of State has been authorised to introduce into the fundamental laws the principle of representation of the different interests by means of direct elections, and the extension of electoral rights and eligibility, the right of initiative, and the publicity of debates.

On the Council of the Empire, to whose province belongs the general legislation, while the Provincial Diets are only competent to legislate on provincial questions, is therefore conferred the right of originating projects of law and publicity of debates.

The Council of the Empire will be composed of members unconditionally elected by the Provincial Diets, and will, besides, receive additional members.

The Provincial Governments of the minor Crown-lands, recently suppressed, are to be reëstablished.

In conclusion, Baron Schmerling exhorts the public functionaries to a conscientious discharge of their duties, to the furtherance of the interests of the inhabitants of their provinces, to a strict observance of the laws, and to candour in their official reports on the condition of the country.

The great difficulty of Schmerling was the apparent necessity of giving to all the non-Hungarian provinces one parliament, and to Hungary another, and thus dividing Austria into two rival states. This difficulty is not solved by allowing the provincial parliaments the power of legislating only on provincial questions; while the Council of the Empire will alone be competent to legislate on imperial questions. For the Hungarian Diet is excepted by name from the disabilities imposed on the other provincial parliaments.

The union of all the non-Hungarian provinces in the Reichsrath obviates one capital defect of Rechberg's plan, the setting up a multitude of small and discordant provincial estates against a large and united Hungary. Schmerling, as a

German, was a national necessity, because Goluchowsky, as a Slavonian, seemed to give a meaning to the Rechberg constitution, which weakened the German element by dividing it, and therefore made the Germans jealous of the Slavonians and other alien races.

It seems that Schmerling will revise the Concordat. This may very likely be necessary for the Catholic interests; half the Concordat executed, and secured by analogous liberties in all other departments of society, will be better than the present agreement, impossible to be carried out, and quite unsafe.

The army of Italy is not discouraged, but eager to fight, and confident of victory. Benedek is not so popular at court as in camp, because the army forced him on the Emperor. As long as the Archduke Albert serves peaceably under him, there will be no breach; if such a misfortune should occur, Wallenstein is spoken of as his successor. It appears likely also that the Archduke Stephen, who in 1848 lost the confidence of both parties, will be again consulted and placed in some great office. He has complete confidence in the result of things in Hungary.

China.

After the breach of the treaty of Tien-tsin, and the disaster at the Taku forts last year, a combined English and French expedition was necessary to secure new guarantees of its observance. August 1st, the allied army of 10,000 men, under Sir Hope Grant and General Montauban, landed at Pehtang, to the north of the Taku forts; on the 12th they advanced to Sinho, and then to Tang-kow, thus placing themselves between Peking and the forts. Aug. 21st, the north fort was taken, with the loss of about 300 men, and all the other forts were occupied, and the Peiho river was opened to within twelve miles of Peking. About the end of August the army marched to Tien-tsin, where the ambassadors were deluded into spending some days in negotiations with commissioners who had no powers. Sept. 9th, the trick was exploded, and the army marched to-

wards Peking; a party of English and French officers was captured by treachery, and treated in such a way that only two out of six of the English survived. After two cheaply-won battles against the Tartar cavalry, Sept. 18th and 21st, and the capture and looting of the Summer Palace, October 13th, Peking surrendered; but the emperor and his court had fled to Zehol, in Tartary. Oct. 18th, the English burnt the Summer Palace. Oct. 24th, Lord Elgin and Prince Kung, the emperor's brother, concluded a peace, of which the principle articles are—

1. An apology from the emperor for the affair at the Taku forts last year.

2. The British minister to reside at Peking.

3. The indemnity, which is doubled, and fixed at 8,000,000 taels, to be paid by instalments.

4. Tien-tsin to be opened to trade immediately.

5. The interdict on emigration removed.

6. Cession of Kow-loon (a strip of land opposite Hong-Kong, and necessary to complete the defences of its harbour) to England.

7. The treaty of Tien-tsin and the convention of Peking to be put in immediate operation.

8. This convention to be published throughout China.

9. Chusan to be evacuated by the English.

The armies were to leave Peking Nov. 8. The French had obtained the restoration of all the buildings formerly belonging to the Catholics in China. The free exercise of Christianity is promised.

United States.

The President's Message, delivered to Congress Dec. 4, 1860, is of more than ordinary importance, as it contains his suggestions for dealing with the secession movements in South Carolina, Georgia, and other slave-states, consequent upon the election of Mr. Lincoln to the Presidency by the Republican party.

The material prosperity of the States is unexampled; but the existence of the Union is threatened. "The long-continued and intempe-

rate interference of the northern people with the question of slavery in the Southern States" has at length caused the formation of "hostile geographical parties." The danger does not arise simply from the quarrel about the provisional exclusion of slavery from the territories till they become states, or from the efforts of particular states to defeat the fugitive law; but from the influence which the Northern agitation has had upon the negroes in the South, and the consequent terror of the planters at the prospect of a servile insurrection. They feel obliged to sacrifice the Union to their own personal safety.

But the secession is not yet accomplished, and may still be averted. The Northern people must put a stop to their agitation against slavery; they must let the South alone to manage its domestic institutions in its own way. They have no right to interfere, and patriotism now commands them to forbear. On the other hand, the Southern people have no right to dissolve the Union on account of any particular person being constitutionally elected to the Presidency, especially if his election is the result of a plurality, not a majority, of the people; for then the case may never occur again. They are bound to wait for some overt unconstitutional act of the President-elect before seceding. But, in fact, whatever his wishes may be, no President can act contrary to the constitution; he is surrounded with so many official checks and safeguards that he must necessarily be a conservative. And, in fact, all the acts of the American government with regard to slavery have hitherto been conservative.

Whatever injustice is done to the Southern States is due, not to the central authority of the Union, not to Congress, whose measures have always favoured the South, but to particular states. The central authority of the Union, whether legislative or judicial, has ever favoured the South, and been its safeguard. Why should the South fear a change? The rights of property can never be abandoned to the legislative interference of the separate states.

For the unconstitutional refusals of

these states to execute the fugitive-slave law neither Congress nor President is responsible. All these acts are null and void. The fugitive law is fundamentally an original part of the constitution, and the next President will violate his duty if he refuses to execute it. Still, unless the different states repeal their unconstitutional enactments, and that "without unnecessary delay, it is impossible for any human power to save the Union."

If the North refuses this act of justice to the South, the latter, after using all constitutional means to obtain redress, will be justified in taking the revolutionary measure of secession. For secession, justifiable or not, will always be revolutionary; since, as Mr. Buchanan argues at length, it is not, and cannot be provided for by the letter of the constitution. But revolutions may be justifiable; for the declaration of independence recognises the right of resistance on the part of the governed against the oppression of their governments.

What, then, is the duty of the executive governor in the present crisis? He is bound to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. But in South Carolina the resignation of all the federal authorities leaves him without means of executing the laws; and the peculiar measures which the constitution sanctions for supplying such deficiency of means are equally inapplicable through the same cause. But where the President lacks constitutional means of enforcing obedience to the constitution, the question must clearly be referred to Congress.

But has Congress authority "to coerce a state into submission which is attempting to withdraw, or has actually withdrawn, from the confederacy?" Historically, the answer is no; theoretically, the problem is impossible. The confederacy is one of free states; but a state loses its freedom by coercion and conquest. Practically, it would be foolish to coerce, for it would prevent future reconciliation. The Union rests upon public opinion, and can never be cemented by the blood of its citizens shed in civil war. If it cannot live

in the affections of the people, it must one day perish.

But conciliation is still possible. If two-thirds of the Congress propose, and two-thirds of the separate states accept, amendments in the constitution, those amendments become law. Let there be such an explanatory amendment on the subject of slavery, containing three articles: (1) recognising the right of property in slaves throughout all the present and future slave-states; (2) protecting this right in all territories that are not yet states, leaving the state legislature free afterwards to determine whether slavery shall be allowed or not; (3) recognising the validity of the fugitive law, which compels the non-slavery states to deliver up runaway negroes to their owners.

Mr. Buchanan's so-called compromise seems to halt upon one leg, inasmuch as he recommends the North to make full submission to the South. He argues quite as a party man, and with manifest inconsistency, inasmuch as he has coerced Texas, though he finds no law for coercing South Carolina. It is clear that if it were possible for Congress and two-thirds of the separate states to adopt his suggestion before Mr. Lincoln's term of office commences, the democratic party and the South would have gained a great victory. But who can tell whether the resentment of a defeat inflicted by such manifest straining of the constitution would not justify the North in secession from the South? Besides, it might possibly happen that a President-elect, who had been chosen to execute the constitutional law as it stood in December 1860, might not be constitutionally bound to execute the alterations of that constitution which had been introduced against his will between his election and his inauguration. This interval was intended by the framers of the constitution to allow time for the electioneering passions to subside before the newly-elected President began business; it was never meant to afford an opportunity for an outgoing President to steal a march on his successor.